DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 302 294 JC 890 021

AUTHOR	Doucette, Don, Ed.
TITLE	Leadership Abstracts, Volume 1, Numbers 1-21, 1988.
INSTITUTION	League for Innovation in the Community Coll., Laguna Hills, CA.; Texas Univ., Austin. Community Coll. Leadership Program.
SPONS AGENCY	Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, Mich.
PUB DATE	88
NOTE	44p.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Viewpoints (120))
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Role; *Board Administrator Relationship; *College Administration; College Faculty; *College Presidents; Community Colleges; Decision Making; Faculty Development; Governance; *Leadership; Leadership Responsibility; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

This series of abstracts from the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program addresses a variety of topics of interest to community college administrators. Topics include: (1) revitalizing leadership for community colleges; (2) improving relations with board members; (3) presidential succession; (4) leadership tasks; (5) faculty leadership; (6) bringing focus to the functions of the college presidency; (7) individual and group responsibility for leadership development; (8) the challenges executives will face in the 21st century; (9) strategies to improve transfer for urban community college students; (10) identifying the distinctive qualities of a community college; (11) institutional governance; (12) a summary of the principal recommendations of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges concerning the future of community colleges; (13) the function of institutional research; (14) staffing as a leadership task; (15) serving students of color; (16) the job of college president; (17) collaborative decision making; (18) board-president relations; (19) demonstrating institutional effectiveness; (20) presidential leadership; and (21) the dangers of electing leaders based on "charisma." (AJL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED302294

LEADERSHIP ABSTRACTS

Volume 1, Numbers 1-21

1988

Don Doucette
Editor

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Doucette

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, The University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

JC 890 021

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

leadership abstracts

REVITALIZING LEADERSHIP FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Terry O'Banion and **John Roueche**

With this first issue, the League for Innovation in the Community College and The University of Texas at Austin are pleased to announce a new publication, *Leadership Abstracts*. To be published twice monthly, *Leadership Abstracts* will be sent without charge to all two-year college chief executive officers in the United States and Canada. Each will receive two copies in hopes that one copy will be duplicated and distributed to board members, key administrators and faculty, other campus leaders, and selected educational policymakers.

The purpose of *Leadership Abstracts* is to provide a forum for the exchange of ideas and practical advice and for the discussion of issues of concern to the leadership of community colleges in North America. The series will attempt to achieve a balance between scholarship and experience-based writing. Topics will range from practical advice on management practices that work to new developments in leadership and motivational theory; they will include commentary on current social and educational issues, as well as research findings related to leadership and community colleges. Contributors will include experienced community college administrators, faculty, and board members; scholars and researchers; and prominent national figures both in and out of the field of education. Those interested in preparing an abstract for consideration are encouraged to write the editor of the series, Don Doucette, for guidelines.

This issue of *Leadership Abstracts* heralds the beginning of a five-year project on leadership development coordinated by the League for Innovation and The University of Texas at Austin with a special grant of $1.7 million from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation.

In addition to publishing *Leadership Abstracts*, other purposes of the collaborative project include identifying and assisting in the preparation for leadership of at least fifty exceptionally talented and committed individuals who are capable of serving as community college presidents in the next five to ten years. Individuals selected will receive Kellogg fellowship support to pursue studies at the Community College Leadership Program at The University of Texas, either as doctoral or post-doctoral students. They will also participate in a paid, semester-long internship with a chief executive officer of a League member institution, who will serve as a professional mentor. Fellowship candidates will be selected from across the United States and Canada, and nominations are invited from current CEO's.

Also as part of the project, eight seminars, workshops, and conferences will be conducted each year that provide leadership development for current community college presidents, vice presidents, deans, faculty, and others with leadership potential. These meetings will be sponsored by the League for Innovation and The University of Texas at Austin; a number will be held in cooperation with other community college organizations that promote and provide leadership development, including AACJC's Presidents' Academy, National Council for Student Development, American Association of Women in Community and Junior Colleges, National Council on Black American Affairs, and National Community College Hispanic Council.

One example of the kind of workshop to be offered is *The Executive Leadership Seminar*, the first of which will be offered June 19-24, 1988, in Newport Beach, California. The purpose of the seminar is to provide an opportunity for potential community college presidents to review their abilities and interests, to refine their skills, and to participate in discussions on leadership with out-

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program.
The University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

standing community college leaders from throughout North America. Through the seminar, the League and its Board of Directors aim to assist in providing continuity in executive leadership as community colleges move into the 21st century.

The seminar, conducted by the League for Innovation in the Community College in collaboration with The University of Texas at Austin and the University of California at Berkeley, is designed as an intensive, week-long session with format varying by topic and purpose. Each seminar will be limited to thirty participants selected on a competitive basis from community colleges throughout North America. The faculty of the seminar will include nationally recognized community college presidents and other leaders who will design a special curriculum to help potential presidents make the final preparation for their move to the presidency.

Leadership Abstracts, and the other activities of the five-year project, come at a very important time in the continuing development of the community college movement. The community college is going through a major period of transition as it moves into the 1990's, and a new concept of community college leadership will be required to direct this transition.

Vaughan's 1986 study of the community college presidency concluded that current presidents are no longer the founders and architects of colleges—a common quality of community college presidents in the 1960's. Just as the early movement required builders, political strategists, organizers, and master plan developers, today's community colleges need strong internal leaders to "help make good on the promise of the open door."

No institution of higher education has ever undertaken a more challenging and difficult educational mission than the open-door college. That open-admissions policy admits the most heterogeneous and diverse student body to be found in any educational setting in the world. Providing quality educational programs and excellent instruction to students who need the most structured support, while at the same time maintaining strong academic programs for well-qualified students and responding effectively to the needs of local communities, is the leadership challenge of the 1990's for community college executives.

Our colleges require leaders who care equally about quality and access. Such leaders must be able to instill and inspire this concern in all faculty and staff members, if community colleges are to see dramatic improvement in student persistence and graduation rates in the years ahead. Such presidents will seek to identify, recruit, and select faculty and staff who truly believe in the mission of the community college—individuals who want to make a difference in the lives of the students they teach. These presidents will lead their institutions in adopting sound educational policies and practices to end the unacceptable attrition rates so common in today's community colleges. They will hasten an end to irresponsible "right to fail" policies in favor of policies that promote and provide students with the right to succeed. These leaders will collaborate with faculty and staff to create campus cultures that value learners and the teaching-learning process. They will care about the numbers of entering freshmen who persist to graduation, and they will be able to answer the basic questions concerning educational quality in their colleges.

Just as the teacher is the key to student success in the classroom, so is the president the key to quality and excellence in the community college. Strong and positive educational leadership is needed for the challenges facing this continent's community colleges. It is our belief that, with a renewed focus and interest in leadership, we will see the emergence of leaders who can lead these colleges to insure that they are truly superior teaching and learning institutions, and who can document that claim.

Terry O'Banion is the Executive Director of the League for Innovation in the Community College. John Roueche is Professor and Director of the Community College Leadership Program at The University of Texas at Austin, where he holds the Sid W. Richardson Chair in Community College Leadership. Both are former Kellogg Fellows.

Volume 1, number 1
January , 1988

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College, 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 203, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

leadership abstracts

MAKING BOARDS PRESIDENTIAL ASSETS

Charles J. Carlsen

After a particularly arduous stint as president of the University of California, Clark Kerr once commented that university presidents spend the vast majority of their time worrying about three things: athletics, parking and sex in the dormitories. That was in the early 1960s. In 1988 he might have added faculty unions, shrinking financial resources and—if he were a community college president—governing boards.

At public four-year colleges and universities, the issue of governance rarely assumes the importance it does at a community college. At a private college, given the right president, it almost never figures in the grand scheme of things. But community college presidents have different agendas, and although athletics and parking may still cause concern, governing boards should be at the top of those agendas. Community college presidents who fail to recognize this are not presidents for long. Perhaps if more did, the average tenure of a community college president would increase from its current level, which is less than five years.

It is important to note that the commitment of time and energy required to build good board relations cannot always assure success. Some boards are inherently unmanageable, with members who place their own ambitions or interests ahead of their institutions' well-being. The president who spends most of his or her time dodging board bullets is not getting the best out of a potentially beneficial relationship. If productive board relations appear to be unattainable, a serious president must evaluate whether the job is worth having.

Nonetheless, most board members do have the best interests of their institutions in mind. By paying attention to a few basic principles, most presidents can significantly improve their relations with their boards and their own effectiveness and satisfaction in their jobs.

Eliminate Surprises

No strategy works for all situations, but some have proven successful over the years. A key to effective board relations is eliminating surprises, mainly by establishing good lines of communication and developing trusting relationships with board members.

A) ***Telephone Often***. An effective president is continually in touch with board members by phone. Two, sometimes three, calls a week to each board member are neither unreasonable, nor wasted effort. The subject can be college business, but it does not have to be. Sometimes just a call to keep in touch is in order. Familiarity does not breed contempt in board relations.

B) ***Provide Thorough Reports.*** The staff and secretaries may complain, but there is no substitution for thorough reports on all issues or potential concerns. Board members appreciate being informed, even if they do not always take time to read everything that is sent them. Many will read the material all the way through. Special color-coded communiques, such as "green sheets," can be used to identify key administrative recommendations. The writing in these should be terse and persuasive. Board members should receive a copy of all college publications, unless they request otherwise. This includes all news releases.

C) ***Make Staff Available.*** One-on-one sessions with key staff members can be particularly effective in helping build trust and confidence. No one can explain the college building program better than the facilities director. The same is true of the college budget officer. Board members should know that a president has confidence in the college staff. Presidents who deny the board contact with staff deny them key resources to better understand the college. Openness and willingness to respond lend credibility to the administrative process.

D) ***Learn Board Members' Personal Agendas***. They may have political ambitions, or they may be dilettantes. Others may have profoundly personal convictions. Some might represent an existing power structure. Most board members have personal agendas, and the smart president identifies these and helps them achieve their goals within the context of useful college activities.

E) ***Exercise Patience***. Presidents must be extremely patient the first year a board member serves, as he or she learns about the institution and about the role and responsibility of a board member. Concerns new board members bring with them can be satisfied during this orientation period, and potential future problems short-circuited. Experienced board members can be used as peer-tutors.

F) ***Get to Know Board Members As People***. Except in rare instances, most board members want to be counted among their president's friends. The smart CEO makes this possible by expressing concern about their personal affairs: family, friends, business, community concerns. However, a president is an employee of the board, and it is generally best to confine socializing to college events. Friendships that are meant to can blossom at the end of a board member's term.

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, The University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

G) ***Always Tell The Truth.*** Too many CEOs get caught trying to hide something that is better dealt with openly. The temptation to hedge or hide a little is always there, but must be resisted, even if the truth is uncomfortable and causes problems—even confrontation—in the short-term. The trust and confidence of the board are a president's most important currency, and just one lie can destroy years of nurtured trust--and end a presidency.

Encourage the Best in Board Members

Board members bring varying skills and abilities to their duties, and it is wise to capitalize on their strengths. In some cases, substantial staff time must be invested to educate board members to the point where they can think and deliberate effectively about the broad issues facing the institution. This is time well spent.

Educating board members about the institution does not necessarily encourage them to become involved in day-to-day administrative affairs—quite the opposite. Well-informed board members are likely to think more broadly and creatively about an institution's needs.

A) ***Identify Potential Problems.*** Perhaps the best way to do this is to go over in some detail the board agenda with board members individually before each meeting. Advance discussion permits board members to ask specific questions and minimizes public miscommunication. Meetings that flow smoothly result from prior preparation and planning.

B) ***Know When to Back Off an Issue.*** Presidents must have extra-long antennae to sense when a proposal may be in trouble. Even when extensive information is provided in advance, the outcome of an administrative recommendation can remain uncertain. In a board meeting, if it appears that there is substantial confusion or dissension about a proposal, it is not a sign of weakness to pull it off the table and regroup. There will be another board meeting next month.

C) ***Know When to Praise and When to Criticize.*** Many of the same techniques a president employs with staff can be applied with board members. A good word for a job well done is as much appreciated by a board member as it is by someone on the faculty. But a board member who overreaches and allows personal agendas to interfere with what is best for the institution must be confronted—in private and in confidence. A president must lead a board, not be led by it. Most board members will respect directness in a president who insists that the best interests of the institution come first.

D) ***Help the Board Focus on Long-Range Planning.*** Master planning is, without question, one of the most important areas of board involvement. Regular sessions should be set throughout the year to permit the board to engage in the planning process. By enabling the board to focus on long-range issues, such as the facilities master plan or the mission statement, a president helps board members develop an understanding of the institution as a whole. By producing long-range plans cooperatively, the president and board cement their partnership.

Encourage the Board to Help Out

Donne's sixteenth century poem--"No man is an island, entire of itself; every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main"--applies particularly well to the modern community college president. Members of the governing board may be the only true peers of the president at his or her institution. They can be a source of both practical help and great strength for a president.

A) ***Encourage Board Attendance at College Events.*** Presidents should make sure board members always are invited to important college events. Press luncheons, foundation dinners, faculty awards banquets, all-staff breakfasts, building dedications, and special recognition dinners all qualify. Such invitations should become a routine matter. But a president should always be sure which board members plan to attend. Board members place a ceremonial stamp of approval on such events.

B) ***Provide Contact with Community Groups.*** Board members should be encouraged to participate on other deliberative bodies within a college's district. A board member can provide practical help to a president by serving on the newly appointed county task force on aging—presumably as a representative of the college in lieu of the president. Involvement in local community organizations can serve a college well, but the president need not be its only top-level representative.

C) ***Invite Cooperation with Volunteer Boards.*** Board members should be invited to all major advisory board meetings held at the college. This is especially true if the college has a foundation board. Although "heavy hitters" on foundation boards can intimidate elected board members, when civic leaders and board members work together, a president gains a powerful alliance.

D) ***Hold an Annual Retreat.*** A president should hold a board retreat once a year for at least a day and preferably for parts of two days to encourage a free exchange of ideas across a wide range of subjects. The board should also perform its annual evaluation of the president at this meeting. Meeting over two days in a facility off campus provides both time for some socializing, and more importantly, distance from everyday concerns.

E) ***Set Stretch Objectives.*** A president should establish a yearly set of objectives beyond what normally might be expected of him or her and place those before the board at its annual retreat. These objectives provide the board an additional, objective means of measuring the effectiveness of the president's leadership. They also encourage performance beyond what would be generally expected. And that, after all, is what leadership is all about.

Charles J. Carlsen is President of Johnson County Community College, Overland Park, Kansas. He is the President of the Board of Directors of the League for Innovation in the Community College for 1988. He will teach a curriculum unit on "board relations" for the League's first annual "Executive Leadership Seminar" to be held in Newport Beach, California, June 19-24, 1988.

Volume 1, number 2
January, 1988

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College, 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 203, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

leadership abstracts

THE DISCOVERY STAGE OF PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

Estela M. Bensimon

More than 300 new college and university presidents take office annually. Once the formal ceremonies are over—and sometimes before—new presidents use a variety of strategies to "take charge" of their institutions: they reorganize, they build their own administrative teams, they announce new programs, and they perform other acts intended to symbolize the beginning of a new and different era for the institution. Despite the considerable importance of presidential succession, beyond the anecdotal, little is known about it or about the institutional responses that are likely to accompany this major organizational event.

A Study on the Discovery Stage

In order to describe more systematically the phenomenon of presidential succession, a study was conducted by the Institutional Leadership Project of the National Center for Postsecondary Governance and Finance, with support from the Lilly Endowment, TIAA-CREF, and the Office of Educational Research and Improvement of the U.S. Department of Education. A purposive sample of 14 new presidents was selected: four from major research universities, four from community colleges, three from public four-year colleges, and three from independent colleges. The data were gathered in face-to-face three-hour interviews conducted during 1986 and 1987.

All presidents interviewed had been in office three years or less at the time of the interview. Two had been in office for less than one year; eight had been in office for more than one year but less than two; and four had been in office for more than two years but less than three. Three had previously been presidents of at least one other institution, and the remaining eleven had been chief academic officers or had held comparable senior positions. Four presidents were insiders, either by moving into the presidency from another position in the institution or by prior affiliation. Ten presidents were men, and four were women.

The responses of these presidents to open-ended questions were coded to develop descriptions of the stages that new presidents appear to go through in taking charge of a college or university. During the interviews, the presidents spoke restrospectively about their initial impressions of their institutions, the actions they took when they first arrived, the most important problems they had to address immediately after taking office, and the kinds of things they recommend that new presidents should do during the first few months of office.

Getting to Know an Institution and Becoming Known

One president said that the first year is spent "figuring out the institution;" another "finding out how the land lies, where the responsibility for management lies, who the strong people are." A third noted that the beginning of the presidency is the time when everyone on and off campus is "anxious to tell you everything that is wrong with the college...people want to inform you and get your attention." It represents an opportunity not to be bypassed, because once the newness wears off, people may not be so candid in sharing "their perceptions of the truth."

Most of the presidents interviewed in the study learned about their institution through a combination of passive and aggressive approaches, waiting for others to approach them in some instances, and being directive and hands-on in others. They identified four basic ways of getting to know an institution:

1) ***Reading***. First, a president reads to study an institution's history, to get information about its operations, and to find out how things are done within its state system. A variety of source materials were mentioned, including newspapers if an institutions's troubles had been chronicled in the press.

2) ***Sensing***. New presidents learn about their institutions from those who have been part of it for a long time. They interpret cues about how others feel based upon what they say, and they visually inspect their institutions.

3) ***Talking***. Some presidents try to talk with as many people both on and off the campus as they can. In a small college, a president might actually talk with every faculty member; in a larger institution, he or she might seek out a diverse group of individuals or identify key players with whom to discuss the institution.

4) ***Budgeting***. This fourth avenue of learning an institution was singled out by the three experienced presidents as their first priority in getting to know their institutions. All three mentioned repeatedly that the budget was both a means by which to "understand the institution," and something to "master" in order to lead it. One referred to the budget as the "president's plan."

Becoming known by institutional constituents in-

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, The University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

volved the same processes as getting to know the institution, but with a different emphasis and purpose. Visiting and making public statements were the most common ways of establishing relationships and gaining recognition mentioned by the presidents.

Crisis, Familiarity, and Prior Presidential Experience

The typical experiences of the discovery stage of presidential succession can be sharply modified by special circumstances. Substantial differences in the discovery process resulted when a president took charge of an institution in crisis, and when a president was either an insider or had had previous presidential experience.

Institutions in Crisis. A small minority of presidents did not explain how they became oriented to their institutions. They were at institutions in crisis and felt there was "no time to sit and study the institution;" they had to "start acting" right away to "clean up the place." One president realized that the faculty expected him to move cautiously, yet he felt that the institution was in such a "state of disrepair, physically and spiritually" that he had no choice but to introduce changes swiftly, even if it meant alienating the faculty. While many presidents in the study recommended seeking contacts with external constituents, a president of an institution in crisis felt that being an external president "making the rounds in talking engagements was not a luxury I could afford."

Insider Presidents. Presidents who had been appointed from within the same institution either bypassed or experienced a shortened discovery period. Because they were already familiar with the institution, they tended to concentrate on specific areas of weakness. Presidents from outside were likely, at least initially, to take a generalist approach to know the institution and to proceed on their own, rather than through the expertise of others, because they had yet to discover the institution. In contrast, insiders tended to focus on discrete areas of concern and to employ consultants, if necessary, to assist them in solving persistent problems.

Experienced Presidents. The three experienced presidents in the sample approached learning about their institutions more aggressively and more systematically than the others interviewed. One sought out "tribal elders;" two made several trips to the institution prior to assuming office. Only one of the eleven first-time presidents ever mentioned an early visit.

Experienced presidents gave noticeably more attention to the budget. They also seemed more sensitive than the newcomers to the importance of knowing the history and understanding the culture of an institution. They seemed to understand that institutions are different from one another, even if they are of the same type (e.g. community colleges). Experienced presidents emphasized the importance of learning about an institution before developing a "plan of action." One said "I think it is foolish to arrive with a plan, because colleges are subtle institutions." A plan not tailored to those subtleties, clearly, would not work.

First-time presidents were noticeably less articulate about what they did to get to know their institutions and to become known. When asked retrospectively about the things they first did at their institutions, such as reorganization, a few pointed out that the changes they made were similar to the changes that had been made at their previous institutions. This hints that they were more inclined to find already familiar features, details, and characteristics in their new colleges—and to miss important but subtle differences.

Consequences of the Discovery Stage

All new presidents have ambitions and expect to make qualitative differences in the lives of their institutions. The discovery stage of presidential succession appears to help presidents position themselves to introduce changes in subsequent stages of taking charge. First, by getting to know their institutions, presidents avoid violating institutional norms. A transactional perspective of leadership suggests that change is more likely to be tolerated if a leader accumulates credits beforehand by demonstrating both competence and conformity to a group's norms. This study suggests that first-time presidents do not have a clear or full sense of how they accumulate—or fail to accumulate—credits.

Second, in the process of getting to know an institution, presidents find out the needs and expectations of different constituencies; the discovery stage, then, helps presidents anticipate which changes will be supported and which opposed. Third, the discovery stage provides presidents with the opportunity to establish visibility and credibility with both internal and external constituencies—and to establish a president in his or her official role as head of the institution.

Despite the apparent importance of the discovery stage in preparing an institution for the introduction of change, the study shows that not all presidents go through it. Presidents of institutions in crisis and insider presidents seem to bypass this stage. This finding suggests that the importance the discovery stage has for a new president may vary according to institutional circumstances. For a new president of an institution in crisis, quick actions may be interpreted as reassuring and, therefore, may be a more effective approach in paving the way for more substantive changes than learning about an institution. The president who comes into a stable institution and attempts to introduce changes is likely to meet with opposition if he or she overlooks the political, symbolic, and collegial processes that are part of the discovery stage.

Estela M. Bensimon is Research Associate and Assistant Director of the Institutional Leadership Project, Teachers College, Columbia University. *This abstract describes one of a series of studies. The complete research report is available as OP 87: 15; National Center for Postsecondary Governance and Finance, University of Maryland, College Park, 6525 Belcrest Road, Suite 430, Hyattsville, MD 20782; (301) 454-1568.*

Volume 1, number 3
February, 1988

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College, 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 203, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

leadership abstracts

LEADERSHIP IS NOT TIDY

Dale Parnell

Leadership cannot be described by the square boxes or dotted lines of an organizational chart. It is a concept that is both difficult to define and subject to popular distortions. We are currently engaged in the dubious discussion of the "wimp factor" as a disqualification for presidential leadership. Did Alexander Haig contribute to an understanding of the attributes of leadership when he turned to George Bush during a presidential debate and recounted that "I didn't hear a wimp out of you," referring to an earlier discussion when both worked in the Reagan White House?

Leadership is often confused with power, prerogatives, and prestige. Both a law enforcement officer and the red and green lights of an intersection have the power to direct traffic, but few would confuse this power with leadership. The wealthy enjoy an array of perks, but they are not necessarily leaders because of their good fortune. A Rolls Royce may symbolize prestige, but it is not a certain signal of leadership.

Leadership is also confused with time-honored management tasks of planning, organizing, staffing, directing, and evaluating; however, the mastery of these functions does not make one a leader. Most leaders can also manage, but leadership is much more. While leadership is evident when it is present, describing it is like trying to catch a cloud or a fog. It is difficult to put in a box.

John Gardner, founder of Common Cause and Independent Sector, has articulated some of our most profound contemporary thoughts on leadership:

> Can leadership be learned? Many intelligent people say "absolutely not!" But the notion that all the attributes of a leader are innate is demonstrably false. No doubt certain characteristics are genetically determined—level of energy, for example. But the individual's hereditary gifts, however notable, leave the issue of future leadership performance undecided, to be settled by later events and influences. Young people with substantial native gifts for leadership often fail to achieve what is in them to achieve. So part of our task is to develop what is naturally there but in need of cultivation. Talent is one thing; its triumphant expression is quite another.

Management talent and leadership talent are not necessarily the same. It is a blessing when these two attributes are combined in one person. Management tasks have generally been well defined; leadership tasks have not been. Nonetheless, clues to the attributes of leadership are provided by examining the tasks and responsibilities which an effective leader must face. These leadership tasks fall into three essential categories.

Clarification of Mission

Nothing is more important for an effective leader than to clarify the mission of the organization that he or she represents. The Good Book says, "Without a vision, the people will perish." Communicating vision is a fundamental task of leadership. Mission clarification and goal-setting, therefore, are priority tasks for an effective leader. We live best by living on our hopes rather than on our fears; by looking to the future, not the past. A leader sets the tone, the motivation, and the positive attitudes about the future of an organization or group that he or she is leading and articulates these clearly as part of the mission and goals of the organization. One wag has simplified the whole issue by defining a leader as a person who has followers. If so, it is vital for followers to have a vision and pride in their contributions to shared

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, The University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

missions and goals.

Related to the clarification of mission is the task of affirming organizational values. When broad consensus about values is absent, is unclear, or loses its motivational force, organizational health and vitality decline. Most individuals are value-driven, and they can be motivated to live up to organizational values if these are clearly communicated by both the practice and the preaching of its leader.

Climate Development

A great leader is usually a great teacher, and one of the key tasks of a leader is to teach. Systematic explanation of the purposes of an organization and the high standards expected of its members is a critical teaching function that falls to its leader. An effective leader does not forget that cows will not stay milked with just one milking; systematic and continual explanation of organizational purposes, values, and style is required to create the climate of an organization, the environment within which its members operate. This teaching function includes not only instruction in how to fulfill organizational expectations, but also motivation and inspiration to convince individuals that they are capable of quality performance.

Another key to climate development is continuing attention to organizational and staff renewal. It is an important leadership task to encourage creativity, diversity, and even, dissent—without tearing up an organization. A leader must assure that an organization balances continuity and change in correct proportion. While the great American philosopher, Mae West, once said, "Too much of a good thing is simply wonderful," a hands-on leader will be sensitive to how much change an organization can stand. An effective leader is also sensitive to the need for staff development. He or she must assure that an organization provides ample opportunity to its individual members for growth and renewal and must participate visibly in the organization's own staff development programs.

Taking symbolic action is a third element of climate development. This leadership task is ignored in much of the literature, even though every leader is necessarily involved in symbolic action. However, symbolic action can be both positive and negative, and it is both planned and unplanned. A leader must understand the importance of symbolism and be sensitive to the meanings attached to a range of activities. An effective leader plans and shapes the symbolism of his or her public actions.

Concept Clarification

Walter Lippman wrote that all of us operate on the basis of "pictures in our heads" rather than real facts. Consequently, a leader must clarify the "picture" of an organization that he or she leads in the minds of its various constituents. Adjusting the focus knob of the slide projector is, in a nutshell, a fundamental task of leadership. A leader must continually focus the image of an organization to maintain clarity of vision and expectation.

The Avis car rental company says, "We try harder." A judge wears a robe in a courtroom. IBM founder, Tom Watson, insisted on dark suits and white shirts for company representatives. Yet not all leaders have consciously established a "picture in the head" for their organizations. Certainly, not all community college executives could articulate the distinct image of their respective institutions.

A leader articulates the image: by consistently representing the organization to its constituents, by networking with other organizations, by paying unrelenting attention to the purposes of the organization and the quality of the product. People develop images of organizations, and effective leaders significantly influence the development of those pictures.

Leadership is not tidy. It is difficult to define, and even more elusive to quantify. At the same time, it can be observed in action, and clues to the attributes of effective leadership are provided by an examination of the essential tasks required of an effective leader. These can be identified by the three "c" template: clarification of mission, climate development, and concept clarification.

Dale Parnell is President and Chief Executive Officer of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. He was the founding president of Lane Community College in Eugene, Oregon; the first chancellor of the San Diego Community College System; and president of San Joaquin Delta College in Stockton, California. He also served as Superintendent of Public Instruction for the State of Oregon, where he helped found the Oregon community college system.

Volume 1, number 4
February, 1988

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College, 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 203, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

leadership abstracts

THE MEANING OF GOOD FACULTY LEADERSHIP

Anna Neumann

What constitutes "good faculty leadership" is a question that generates considerable attention but little agreement on college and university campuses. The literature has focused on the faculty collectivity, but has generally failed to consider faculty leadership at the operating level that affects campus governance.

Studying Perceptions of Faculty Leadership

In order to clarify perceptions of "good faculty leadership" and to determine their implications for campus governance, a study was conducted by the Institutional Leadership Project of the National Center for Postsecondary Governance and Finance, with support from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement of the U.S. Department of Education. A national sample of 32 institutions, evenly divided among research/doctoral granting universities, state colleges and universities, independent colleges, and community colleges, was selected.

Data were gathered in private, one-to-one interviews with the president and an identified faculty officer at each institution during three-day site visits to the campuses during 1986-87. The results are based upon the responses of 31 presidents and 29 selected faculty officers to the question: "How would you describe good faculty leadership?" In this study, the faculty officer was usually the head of the faculty senate (21). If a senate head was not available, another faculty leader was interviewed, for example, the former head of the faculty senate (2), the head of the faculty union (3), or an informal faculty leader (3).

Presidents' and faculty officers' depictions of good faculty leadership were searched for patterns of consistency and contrast, with special attention to what they see as the focus or object of such leadership. The data yielded two conceptually related categories, or perspectives, each consisting of two domains. Respondents' definitions were then content-analyzed and coded according to this scheme. First, the presidents' and faculty officers' responses were analyzed separately to determine how the respondent's role affects how he or she conceives of good faculty leadership. Then, the paired responses of the president and faculty officer at each institution were checked for intra-campus consistency, and campus conditions were observed that might relate to the consistency of their responses.

Responses by Role

When presidents and faculty officers described good faculty leadership, they tended to use one of two perspectives: they focused on the organization or its parts—an institutional perspective, or on the activities of the faculty leader—a professional perspective. An institutional perspective consists of two organizational domains: the total campus and the academic unit. A professional perspective consists of two activity domains: concern for welfare of the collective faculty or involvement in traditional academic activities.

Institutional Perspective. Presidents and faculty officers who used an institutional perspective to define good faculty leadership largely agreed with each other. Both emphasized the campus over the academic unit; few saw the academic department or division as the locus of faculty leadership. One faculty officer said that faculty leaders "need to be able to put the institution first and to understand the directions that it needs to take for its own good, as opposed to fighting for one's own program." A president equated good faculty leadership with "responsible institutional citizenship," and another said that good faculty leaders are committed to the "development of the institution."

Professional Perspective. Presidents and faculty officers were much more likely to differ when they used a professional perspective. To presidents, good faculty leadership was likely to mean giving attention to academic activities, "teaching students, scholarship, and research," or "the delivery of quality education... staying close to the customer." Very few of the presidents equated good faculty leadership with concern for the faculty's welfare or rights. Most of the presidents simply did not mention this domain, but others expressed outright the belief that good faculty leadership should not confine itself to the faculty as a separate body. One referred to faculty leaders who "so many times...can be self-serving;" another said that good faculty leaders are "not selfish" and need to avoid "the need for unanimous support" from the faculty.

In contrast, only one-fifth of the faculty officers described good faculty leadership as attending to the traditional academic arenas of teaching and research. Most faculty officers spoke about the faculty's welfare. One described his role as "getting some consensus among faculty and providing leadership." Another said

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, The University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

that faculty leaders "have to be conscious they are speaking for the faculty."

In summary, college presidents and faculty officers seemed to agree with each other when they spoke from the less controversial institutional perspective, but they differed dramatically when they considered a professional perspective on faculty leadership. College presidents were likely to see the ideal faculty leader as an outstanding academic model, urging others to academic excellence, while faculty officers tended to interpret the faculty leadership role as attending to the needs, interests, rights, and general welfare of the faculty—a body distinct from, although lodged within, the larger organization.

Responses by Campus

The study also examined the extent to which presidents and faculty officers were able to see eye-to-eye on their own campuses about the meaning of good faculty leadership. For this analysis, a president and faculty officer were considered to agree or be consistent if they concurred on at least one of the four domains of faculty leadership noted previously. They were considered to differ if they concurred on no domain.

The president and faculty member displayed at least partial agreement on 10 of 29 campuses, or 34 percent of the institutions for which complete data were available; they differed with each other in fully two-thirds of the cases. Even those presidents and faculty officers who did agree, agreed about different things—further indicating the extent of the discrepancies in perception of good faculty leadership held by presidents and faculty leaders.

The presidents and faculty officers were equally inconsistent in the ways that they differed with each other, although these differences tended to fall into one of three clear patterns: 1) a president saying that faculty leaders should attend to academic activity paired with a faculty leader favoring attention to faculty welfare and rights (21 percent), 2) a president perceiving that faculty leaders have an obligation to the campus as a whole with the faculty officer concerned about the faculty's welfare and rights (28 percent), and 3) a president favoring attention to academic activity coupled with a faculty officer focusing on campus concerns (21 percent).

Conditions Affecting Agreement

The study also considered the campus conditions which facilitated or hampered agreement between a president and faculty officer about faculty leadership. The effects of institutional control, institutional size, presence of collective bargaining, stage of presidential tenure, and gender of the president were not related tothe ability of presidents and their faculty officers to agree on the meaning of good faculty leadership.

However, institutional type was an important factor in this ability to agree. A president and faculty officer were far more likely to have disparate views of faculty leadership in a community or state college than in other types of institutions. In contrast, presidents and faculty officers in universities were likely to reach some agreement. In independent colleges, presidents and their faculty officers were as likely as not to reach consensus.

Patterns of difference emerged. In community and state colleges, the typical difference involved a president who perceived that faculty leaders should pay attention to the campus or traditional academic activity and a faculty officer who believed that they should be primarily concerned with the faculty's welfare and rights.

Consequences of Ill-Defined Expectations

This research suggests that faculty leaders fill ill-defined roles. Their own beliefs about good faculty leadership may vary dramatically from those of their presidents, suggesting that administrators and faculty leaders will also differ in what they expect a faculty leader to do and not to do. As a result, presidents might misinterpret or misjudge faculty leaders' actions, and faculty leaders might similarly misconstrue their presidents' positions.

The major finding of the study—that presidents and faculty officers differ substantially on what constitutes good faculty leadership—suggests that both should make their beliefs and expectations about the role of faculty leaders known to each other early in their working relationships. Knowing and appreciating differences may not avert future disagreement, but it may provide the understanding, predictability, and tolerance necessary for open discussion of difficult campus issues.

The study also indicates that presidents and faculty officers in community and state colleges are more likely to differ in their perceptions of what constitutes good faculty leadership than their counterparts in other types of institutions. It is possible to speculate about reasons for this finding, although the presence of collective bargaining was ruled out as a factor by the study. Other writers have described community and state colleges as more vulnerable to environmental pressures, centralization, bureaucratization, and administrative intrusion, which would intensify a faculty's need to assert its rights. Furthermore, faculty senates are generally newer to community and state colleges, suggesting that presidents and faculty leaders may be in the process of negotiating an institutional place for faculty leadership.

In this context, presidents of community and state colleges should make time to talk with faculty leaders about their perceived roles—and be willing to explore points of view that are likely to be different from their own.

Anna Neumann is Research Associate and Assistant Director of the Institutional Leadership Project, Teachers College, Columbia University. *This abstract describes one in a series of studies; the complete report is available as OP 87:21; National Center for Postsecondary Governance and Finance, Room 4114, CSS Building (224), University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742-2411; (301) 454-1568.*

Volume 1, number 5
March, 1988

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College, 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 203, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

leadership abstracts

BRINGING FOCUS TO THE PRESIDENCY

George B. Vaughan

During the boom period of public community college growth, community college presidents came from backgrounds that varied almost as much as the community colleges they led. A number of the early presidents performed the herculean task of opening new colleges, a task many did extremely well. Moreover, in spite of their varied backgrounds (or perhaps because of them), those presidents played a major role in shaping the community college's mission and in bringing a focus to the presidency.

In retrospect, the focus the early presidents brought to the presidency was clear: the president moved into an area, built buildings, employed faculty and staff, developed curricula, recruited students, placed the teaching and learning process in motion, and told anyone who would listen of the wonders the community college held. But times have changed. Today, there is a need for presidents to re-examine the functions of the presidency in a way that brings focus to the position, a focus that is often lacking.

Functions of the Presidency

One way of bringing focus to the presidency is to determine what the functions of the position should be. Based upon a large number of interviews with presidents and trustees, a number of readings related to the college and university presidency, and personal observations, it appears that three major functions fall under the umbrella of the president's office:

1) Managing the institution.
2) Creating the campus climate.
3) Interpreting and communicating the institution's mission.

These functions can be carried out effectively only if the president views the institution broadly and understands the relationship among the three functions. This means that the president must do more than understand the three functions: the president must see that those who manage the day-to-day affairs of the institution keep the institutional climate and mission central to all that they do. Obviously, the three functions are never clear-cut, for they quite naturally overlap. For example, how the institution is managed has a profound effect on campus environment. The overlapping of the three functions dictates that the leadership of the president be prominent in each of the three areas, a prominence that demands that the president provide leadership to the entire college community and to important segments of the community at large, a prominence that requires the president to be an educational leader.

The community college presidency has outgrown its adolescence, and mid-life has exposed some of its weaknesses. For example, today many presidents suffer from the illusion that the community college can be all things to all people, can solve all of society's ills. They believe that they can and should be involved with all aspects of campus operations, be everywhere, and speak on everything—assumptions which are false and which ultimately weaken the presidency.

During much of the history of the modern community college, management was in vogue. However, for the past few years, leadership has been the major topic of discussion. The tendency has been to discuss functions in terms of management versus leadership or to categorize functions in terms of leadership functions and management functions. However, the dichotomy often drawn between leadership and management is a false one in relationship to the community college presidency and only tends to confuse rather than enlighten. At times the most charismatic leader functions as a manager; at times the most bureaucratic president must lead. The following three functions bring focus to the presidency without falling into the trap of separating leadership from management. Inherent in the following discussion is the belief that in order to carry out the three functions effectively, the president must be the institution's educational leader.

Managing the Institution

The president is responsible for seeing that the enterprise is managed effectively and efficiently. The debate as to whether the effective leader is an effective manager is fallacious. The institution must be managed well, and it is up to the president to see that good management exists, regardless of how much of this function is delegated, and how much of it should be. Management consists of more than filling out forms, making up class schedules, and seeing that the payroll is met; management involves resource allocation, and how resources are allocated ultimately determines the college's mission. As manager, the president must see that policies and procedures are fair and that they are applied fairly and consistently; as manager, the president must see that everything moves in concert with the institutional mission, including food services, buildings and grounds, instruction, student services and so on.

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, The University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

At times it seems to many, especially the faculty, that the president devotes an inordinate amount of time to the management function and too little time to the other major functions falling under the umbrella of the president's office. Presidents devote considerable time to the management function primarily for two reasons: poor management often gets the president into trouble, for everyone, especially the governing board, wants a well-managed institution; and the management function produces results that can be seen by the president and others, thus giving presidents a sense of accomplishment. The management function is the one that is most often discussed in the literature on higher education and is the one that many presidents tend to view as constituting the whole of leadership. Nevertheless, while there is much more to the presidency than effective management, the successful president realizes that solid management is the foundation on which dreams must rest, for without good management the foundation crumbles, no matter how appealing the dream.

Creating the Campus Climate

The president has the primary responsibility for creating a climate on campus in which students, faculty, and staff can achieve their full potential as learners, as professionals, as workers, and as members of the college community. In creating the campus climate, the president plays a vital role in setting the tone and pace—establishing the campus mood—that other members of the college community can sense, identify with, and emulate.

There are a number of questions that can be asked to help gauge campus climate. Is the tone one of friendliness, of professionalism, of excellence in all things, of caring, of doing all that is possible to see that students learn, that teachers teach, and that staff members serve? Is the tone one that encourages experimentation? That is, do members of the college community not only have the right to try new things but also the responsibility, even if they occasionally fail? Is the pace one that accommodates change in an orderly and accepted fashion? Are avenues available whereby faculty and staff can participate in the renewal process? Are financial and physical resources adequate not only to achieve the basic mission of the institution but also to achieve an edge of excellence in the teaching and learning process?

In setting the institutional climate, the president has the primary responsibility for assuring that a reasonable degree of balance exists between institutional, community, and individual concerns and needs. A reasonable balance can be maintained only if institutional expectations are discussed, defined, and communicated to both external and internal constituents, an often difficult task and one that requires the greatest skill from an educational leader. While maintaining a degree of balance, the president must encourage individual and group initiatives that will constantly move individuals to new heights in their thinking and deeds and that will constantly move the institution to new heights in its service to the community and to the individual. In setting the institutional climate, the president has the primary responsibility to see that institutional integrity is maintained in the curriculum, in institutional management, in external relationships, and in all that the college does. And lest one forget, the president has the responsibility for the final decision, for stopping the buck.

Communicating the Mission

The third major function of the president is to communicate the mission of the college effectively and consistently to the college's various constituents, including trustees, legislators, and members of the executive branch; to local leaders in business and industry, in government and in the local community at large; to other educators, students, faculty, and staff; and to the general public. It is through this function that the president instills a vision of what the institution is capable of becoming; it is through this function that the president in conjunction with the governing board defines the purpose of the institution.

One of the most significant findings in my study of the community college presidency was that presidents, trustees, and others perceived the overwhelming failure of the community college to be the unwillingness or inability of its leaders, especially presidents, to interpret and articulate the institution's mission effectively, consistently, and positively to the college's various publics. In articulating the mission, the president must realize that the college's constituents are marchers in a passing parade, not a stable, captive audience. Legislators change, trustees change, faculties change, high school teachers change, community college students change, and presidents change. The parade marches on. Indeed, the president's own tenure in office may depend upon how well the college's mission is understood and supported, especially by trustees and legislators. While community college leaders will never rid the language of the phrase "they don't understand us," presidents must work constantly to shrink the numbers falling under the rubric of "they."

To summarize, this brief statement has set forth the belief that the community college presidency has lost the focus that was present during the early years when a number of presidents were founding new colleges. A clearer focus can be brought to the presidency if presidents are primarily concerned with managing the institution, creating the campus climate, and communicating the mission. Moreover, the president must be the institution's educational leader if the three functions are to be carried out effectively.

George B. Vaughan is President of Virginia Piedmont Community College in Charlottesville, Virginia. He is the author of The Community College Presidency, and serves on the Board of Directors of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Volume 1, number 6
March, 1988

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College, 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 203, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

leadership abstracts

INDIVIDUAL AND GROUP RESPONSIBILITY FOR LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

Jess H. Parrish

The alarm has been sounded in speeches, articles, reports, and conversations among colleagues: the first generation of great community college leaders is passing from the scene, and its replacement is uncertain. O'Banion and Roueche, in the inaugural issue of this abstract series, repeat the refrain and call for a concerted effort to "revitalize leadership in community colleges." However, batteries are only recharged when they are dead or dying. The concern that a vacuum of leadership exists or is threatened is overstated. The community college movement does not need to be revitalized; it needs only to tap the vitality of its current leaders and to assist in developing the next generation of leaders from among its ranks.

Granted, the first generation of great leaders has either departed or is on the way out. It may be instinctive to adopt a "they don't make them the way they used to" attitude, and this sentiment causes alarm at the passing of these leaders. Sentiment and a desire to hang on to heroes and the "good old days" make replacing this generation seem not only impossible, but perhaps a touch disrespectful.

However, the reality of the current situation is much different. Leaders, like athletes, are bigger, stronger, quicker, and better coached than ever. A generation of community college lore is available to current and up-and-coming leaders, and the smart ones are using it. If this is the actual situation, then the principal task of those who wish to maintain and improve the vitality of community college leadership is to identify and develop the pool of talent already available.

Somewhere out there is another Priest, another Cosand, and another Fordyce. There are other Colverts, Martoranas, and Wattenbargers. Perhaps another Gleazer or Koltai. Community colleges need them all—the doers, the thinkers, the theorists, and the writers.

If the young leaders are out there, the central question becomes how best to insure their development. Current community college presidents must accept a major responsibility for nurturing the development of this next generation of leaders. They are positioned to identify talented individuals and to assist them in the various roads to the top. They can contribute to the evolution of the next great generation of leaders in numerous ways, both formal and informal. Community college presidents must seize the opportunities to encourage leadership development available to them as individuals, and they must work collectively to institutionalize efforts to identify leadership talent and provide opportunities for it to be realized.

Individual Efforts

No good community college has only one leader. Good leaders attract other leaders and those with leadership potential. In fact, most quality community colleges fairly exude leadership. It is found in the custodial staff, the clerical staff, the faculty, and on up through the administrative structure. Presidents whose insistence on quality has been realized in their colleges' hiring practices are surrounded with raw material; the opportunity to develop this pool of talent is limited only by the creativity and initiative of the president.

Leadership is often a combination of the instinct to foresee the possible outcomes of a decision combined with the experience to recognize what options are available. Experienced presidents have learned by trial and error the ability to recognize not only the options available in decision making, but also the ability to recognize the proper option to take. While presidents can not do much to impart instincts to developing leaders, they can provide the experience necessary to test their innate instincts.

There are ways to share experience not only with young and developing leaders, but also with experienced professionals whose backgrounds have been narrow or highly specialized. Most presidents routinely involve staff members in the decision-making process because they value and appreciate their input, and because presidents recognize that better decisions result from such collective wisdom. However, many presidents miss the opportunity to share problem solving and decision making with staff members strictly as a learning opportunity.

Student personnel deans can learn from the opportunity to think through academic problems and, in the process, can grow and become more effective in their own responsibilities. Chief business officers can be challenged by being asked to solve a student discipline problem, either before or after it is resolved. Academic administrators are often skilled in faculty personnel problems and the academic budget, but they can expand

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, The University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

their skills by being involved in decisions related to utility bills, land acquisition, tax rates, and public relations. Presidents can provide effective leadership development opportunities by creatively involving potential leaders in all aspects of college operations.

Group second guessing can also be used effectively as a tool for leadership development. Administrative councils can dissect previous presidential decisions as case studies. Discussions of board meetings on the day after can be a great learning experience on group dynamics, press relations, and president-board relations—all critical experiences for emerging leaders to have.

Because leadership is a process of becoming, leaders can not pinpoint when they became leaders. Becoming a leader is a developmental process that exemplifies the ideal of lifelong learning to which community colleges are committed. If leadership development is approached from the collegial "let's become leaders together" perspective, rather than from the condescending "I am going to teach you to be a leader" attitude, the process can be rewarding for both mentor and protege. Obviously, not all will become great leaders as a result of such nurturing, but all will become more skilled.

Presidents can not be responsible for personally assisting in the development of all potential leaders in their institutions. However, they can insure that someone is responsible. They can make a visible commitment to leadership development as an important institutional value. They can insure that all administrative staff understand that identifying, encouraging, and providing potential leaders throughout the college with opportunities to develop is an important priority.

Group Efforts: AACJC's Presidents Academy

Leadership development is also the responsibility of organized groups. In fact, much of what is recognized as leadership development has been accomplished by the more formal efforts of state and national community college associations. State associations of presidents and trustees have long been important vehicles for efforts to both maintain and develop quality leadership for community colleges. Foundations, consortia, and universities have also taken major initiatives in leadership development, including the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, The University of Texas at Austin, and the League for Innovation in the Community College, whose joint efforts have produced not only this publication but several other leadership development programs.

Yet, perhaps one of the the most available vehicles for leadership development in community colleges nationwide is the Presidents Academy of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. The academy, as an affiliate of AACJC, is composed of the chief executive officers of all AACJC member institutions. It is the broadest based organization in the community college field organized to provide professional development opportunities, and its membership makes it one of the most influential.

The Presidents Academy has been engaged in leadership development activities since its inception. Each summer it sponsors a national seminar in Vail, Colorado, on topics of concern to community college presidents. Prominent experts have joined presidents in this informal setting to discuss such issues as effective planning processes, the dilemma of diverse student populations, and the future of community colleges. A special feature of the seminar has been providing new presidents the opportunity to benefit from the insights of experienced presidents concerning both the professional challenges of the presidency and its personal demands.

The academy also sponsors programs at various national meetings, including hosting a major luncheon and program at the annual AACJC convention, and special sessions at the national conference of the Association of Community College Trustees. It develops publications, including monographs, journal articles, studies, and directories, and conducts an awards competition for presidential speeches that are subsequently published in the *Community, Technical, and Junior College Journal*. The academy actively encourages participation in all of these activities by presidents from all member institutions.

However, the Presidents Academy is both well-positioned and inclined to expand its role in identifying and developing leaders for community colleges. The executive committee of the academy is currently engaged in a self-study to determine the organization's responsibility for leadership development. While acknowledging its limitations in staff and budget to support new leadership development initiatives, the academy will capitalize on its greatest asset—the collective wisdom, creativity, and energy of the critical mass of over one thousand community college presidents who have a vital interest in leadership development.

Both as individuals and collectively through the Presidents Academy, we community college presidents will prove that our batteries are not dead and that no recharging is necessary to maintain and nourish leadership in community colleges. On behalf of the academy, let me invite you to join us in this effort.

Each of us can be part of leadership development on our own campuses. It is important that we share our skills, experience, and several lifetimes of learning with the new kids on our blocks. Wouldn't it be nice to leave our institutions in better hands than ours?

Jess H. Parrish is the chair of the Presidents Academy for 1988-89. He has been president of Midland College in Midland, Texas, since 1981; he was the founding president of Shelby State Community College in Memphis, Tennessee. He is past chair of the board of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges and recipient of the Marie Y. Martin Administrator Award from the Association of Community College Trustees.

Volume 1, number 7
April 1988

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College, 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 203, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

leadership abstracts

THE 21st CENTURY EXECUTIVE

abstracted from *U. S. News & World Report*

[Editor's note. The cover story of the March 7, 1988, issue of *U. S. News & World Report* notes that the year 2000, once a benchmark of science fiction, looms only forty-seven quarterly reports away. Further, the writers argue that U. S. corporations face unprecedented challenges from a host of foreign competitors—challenges that must be faced by a new breed of corporate executives. *U. S. News* interviewed scores of executives, management consultants, and business-school professors to identify the principal traits that will define the successful twenty-first century executive. Although community college leaders contend in a somewhat different arena, these traits, described below, are pertinent to the challenges that they too will face in the next century.]

Global Strategist

Tomorrow's executive will have to feel as "at home" in Sapporo or Strasbourg as in San Francisco. Having a dog-eared passport and stacks of frequent flier memberships and knowing something more than restaurant French or Japanese will pay dividends at contract time that may not accrue simply by showing up with a reasonably priced product. Designing and marketing goods or services for several countries should become second nature. Future CEOs "must have an understanding of how to manage in an international environment," asserts Lester Thurow, dean of MIT's Sloan School of Management. "To be trained as an 'American' manager is to be trained for a world that is no longer there."

The U. S. cannot reclaim the unchallenged economic dominance it enjoyed in the 1950s and 1960s. Instead, the watchwords of the future are global interdependence, be it through economic policies orchestrated among commercial partners, multinational corporate deals, or international capital flows. Total two-way trade between major industrial powers has surged 16 percent since 1980. Last year alone there were nineteen international mergers of one billion dollars or more, part of nearly one hundred billion dollars in international mergers, acquisitions and divestitures.

An overseas focus clearly pays off. A nine-month study by McKinsey & Company of fast-growth, mid-sized members of the American Business Conference showed average foreign sales up nearly 20 percent annually between 1981 and 1986. But "success is no accident," concludes the report. It is "the product of the CEO's vision: a perception early on that international expansion is not a sideline but integral to the future."

Many of America's corporate kingpins boast little of that foresight—nor do they prize international experience. A 1986 survey of company heads by the executive-search firm Korn-Ferry International revealed that while 68 percent regarded time spent overseas as "valuable," only 0.4 percent thought it the fastest route to the top. Language ranked near the bottom of management requisites in a poll of multinationals by Moran, Stahl & Boyer, a Boulder, Colorado, company that runs "culture camps" for outbound executives. And foreign postings, while gaining some popularity, typically last no more than three years—far less than the seven to ten years many Japanese managers spend as expatriates. This not only shortchanges the businessperson; it cripples a company's chance of parlaying long-term gains from his or her contacts.

Master of Technology

From lap-tops to assembly-line robotics, as the pace of technological changes accelerates, CEOs must not only stay abreast of innovations. Like Ford Chairman Donald Petersen, an engineer by training, they must learn how to harness new technology to make better products—and sharper decisions. They can scarcely afford not to. A two million dollar computerized "expert system" in American Express' Fort Lauderdale, Florida, credit-authorization office has both speeded approvals and halved bad-debt losses, simply by presenting data in a manner easier to read and assess.

Computer literacy will be essential for the next generation of senior executives—and their employees. While information processing claims 40 percent of all capital spending today, about the only piece of equipment most chief executives know how to operate is a telephone. Unlike earlier waves of automation that merely allowed companies to process paperwork faster, the latest tools put vast arrays of facts and figures at a manager's fingertips. Literally thousands of documents can be culled electronically through outside databases, while in-house options papers may sport color graphics plus rigorous statistical analysis. The computer's potential for refining organizational structure is just as enormous; smart machines ideally can give front-line workers crucial operating data. "You've got to leave the hierarchy out of it," contends Harvard labor expert Shoshana Zuboff, "and give information to those who

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, The University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

deal with customers so they can make flexible, rapid decisions."

Foreseeing the alterations that technological breakthroughs may force on a company will also be a twenty-first century requisite. In an industry where change is a constant and competition cutthroat, Roger Johnson, CEO of Western Digital Corporation in Irvine, California, has steered his computer-component firm through a turnaround and onto a 54 percent growth curve through constant innovation. One communications chip underwent five design changes in a single day. Separate circuit boards have been miniaturized to fit on a single "motherboard," and Johnson envisions the day when the workings of an entire IBM/AT computer can be crammed onto one chip. That type of computing power could be applied in a limitless variety of everyday items from cars to cameras.

Politician Par Excellence

If business leaders think they are hip deep in a bog of complexity now, they are bound to flounder even further when attempting to take their companies global. "Nonmarket forces," such as local and national regulations, treaties, legal requirements and demands of international agencies, will occupy a good deal more of a CEO's time, predicts Stanford School of Business Dean Robert Jaedicke.

The current thicket of nontariff trade barriers illustrates the pitfalls ahead. Catch-22 regulations effectively bar foreign construction companies from bidding on projects in Japan, for example, by demanding that builders have a prior domestic track record. The U.S. and Japanese governments have resumed efforts to resolve this impasse, which could lead to billions of dollars in business for American contractors. But plenty of other barriers remain. "Buy national" sentiments in West Germany, Italy, France and Britain have halted turbine manufacturers such as Westinghouse and General Electric from gleaning any significant share of those markets. And the insistence of Switzerland and Singapore that data must be processed within their borders before being sent abroad can prove costly to a company like Motorola, which daily transmits nearly four billion characters—enough information to fill a bookcase nine feet high by ten feet long.

The bigger the corporation and the more global its sweep, the more its chief executive must be the consummate politician. Consultants at Arthur D. Little predict that the future belongs to the "megacorporation," or global federations of multibillion-dollar operating groups whose senior managers will concern themselves chiefly with balancing the conglomerate's economic interests with those of the local culture. Perhaps the man who comes closest to fitting the "megamanager" mold today is American Express CEO James Robinson. He moves easily between the worlds of finance and politics, overseeing new business development that has spurred a robust 306 percent growth in the company's net income since 1977, while also finding time to jawbone Washington officials on free trade.

Leader/Motivator

Old-fashioned leadership qualities will not disappear in the twenty-first century. Indeed, to shepherd companies successfully through times of disorienting change, a CEO will need a double dollop of moxie and charisma. However, he or she must be less a commander than a coach who "converts people and persuades them to shared values," suggests Michael Silva, co-author with Craig Hickman of *The Future 500*. Citicorp's chief John Reed typifies this management style Silva believes, because he has unified diverse opinions among his top echelon and built a consensus on how best to chart the financial giant's future course.

The leader who reorganizes his staff as creatively as he streamlines his plant also stands to gain on his competitors. Corporations, says management expert Peter Drucker, are evolving into entities of fewer layers, structured like orchestras with teams of "knowledge workers" pooling expertise on a single opus. This approach, widely practiced in Japan, is making significant inroads in the U. S. as chairmen begin to appreciate its potential for tapping employee ideas and energy. Averitt Express, a trucking firm based in Cookeville, Tennessee, saw last year's sales shoot up 38 percent, earnings by 48 percent, after dividing its 1,400 employees into productivity-improvement groups of between three and ten members. "We just take the coach approach," explains Averitt CEO Gary Sasser. "Lots of feedback, lots of encouragement; our people do the rest."

Applying the team concept to senior management proves trickier. Growing complexity, declares Thomas Neff, president of the New York executive-recruiting firm Spencer Stuart, means "no more room for the one-man-band CEO." At Pittsburgh's Mellon Bank, a five-member team headed by Chairman Frank Cahouet has been working quite successfully since last June to cut costs and redirect the ailing institution toward more-profitable lines of business. But other collaborations have fallen victim to ego clashes. "Eventually," says Gulf & Western CEO Martin Davis, known for his forceful personality, "somebody has to say yes or no."

Perhaps no executive today perfectly embodies all the characteristics experts deem vital for twenty-first century success. Every organization has different needs. But whether through teamwork or by personal fiat, business leaders must manage large-scale rapid change, envision business conditions five or ten years down the road and muster the courage to steer a firm in radical new directions. They have just over a decade—mere minutes as measured by the clock of world history—to ready their road maps for the rough ride ahead.

Copyright 1988 by U. S. News & World Report. Printed by permission. Abstracted from "The 21st Century Executive," March 7, 1988, U. S. News & World Report, by Clemens P. Work with Beth Brophy, Andrea Gabor and Robert F. Black, and Mike Tharp, and Alice Z. Cuneo.

Volume 1, number 8
April 1988

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College, 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 203, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

leadership abstracts

IMPROVING TRANSFER FOR URBAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE STUDENTS

Richard C. Richardson, Jr.

Minorities are a growing part of the pool of 18-22 year olds from which colleges and universities have traditionally drawn the majority of their students. However, while high school graduation rates for minority students have increased significantly in the past twenty years, college participation rates and baccalaureate degrees earned by blacks and Hispanics peaked in the mid-1970s and have since declined. Of even greater concern is that minorities are concentrated in about fifty institutions—primarily urban colleges and universities enrolling predominantly minority students.

The fact is that minority higher education has become a distinctly urban phenomenon, and this fact has serious consequences for the prospects of minorities aspiring to the socio-economic mobility associated with earning the baccalaureate degree. The evidence suggests that transfer from two-year colleges to four-year institutions works well for most students most of the time, but it is not so clear that the transfer function, upon which democratic notions of access to higher education depend, works well in the urban community colleges where most minority students enroll. In fact, available evidence suggests that transfer may be a qualitatively and quantitatively different experience in urban settings.

Two Studies

Based upon this analysis, funding was obtained from the Ford Foundation in 1984 to undertake a two-year study in eight major cities. Its purpose was to assess the policies and practices which facilitate or impede the progress of minority students to the baccalaureate degree for those who begin their postsecondary education in an urban community college. Prior to the conclusion of the Ford study, the Office of Educational Research and Improvement of the U. S. Department of Education funded a related study of ten universities with above average records for graduating minority students.[1]

Both studies relied primarily on case study methodology. The Ford study involved site visits to paired community colleges and universities in eight major urban areas. In each city, the community college enrolling the highest percentage of minority students was studied, as was the university to which the community college transferred the largest number of students. A mailed survey—which elicited a 58 percent response rate—was also used to evaluate the experiences of a random sample of students who had transferred from each participating community college to its paired university.

In the OERI study, a research team conducted detailed studies of ten predominantly white universities with successful experiences graduating minority students. The methodology included analysis of enrollment and graduation data and interviews with minority graduates, faculty, administrators and community leaders. The studies identified both barriers to effective transfer and strategies for improving articulation.

Barriers to Effective Transfer

The Ford study showed that barriers which impeded the flow of students from urban community colleges to four-year institutions were the result of practices of both institutions.

Barriers Erected by Community Colleges. Community colleges, as "open door" institutions, enrolled students with an incredible diversity of skills, yet many practiced "right to fail" policies by permitting students to enroll in courses of their choice regardless of whether their previous preparation had provided them with the skills they needed to succeed. Also, community college faculty, when confronted with extreme heterogeneity in transfer courses, adjusted standards to those they believed students could achieve rather than preserving standards comparable to those in parallel courses at their four-year counterparts. Students in the study who attended community colleges without rigorous assessment practices described the rigor of their courses as inadequate to prepare them for the demands of their transfer institution.

Norm-referenced grading systems were prevalent among community colleges in the study. Their effect was to make excuses for student deficiencies rather than requiring students to achieve. Students transferring from such settings were poorly prepared to meet the demands of the university.

Placing community colleges in close proximity to those they serve has produced urban campuses that are among the most segregated in the United States. Institutions serving predominantly minority student populations frequently placed vocational training as their highest priority—and were typically ignored by universities in their recruiting efforts.

Students surveyed reported over and over again that the advising and counseling services they received in their community colleges were totally inadequate. The single most important source of complaint was inaccurate information about which courses would transfer to four-year institutions.

Barriers Erected by Four-Year Institutions. Faculty and administrators at four-year institutions believed that they were preserving important academic values when they hired without considering race or ethnicity. As a result, these universities, unlike their two-year counterparts, have made almost miniscule gains in achieving the representation among their professional staffs necessary to reflect their changing student populations. Minority students often perceived four-year environments as hostile, even racist.

Four-year colleges and universities exhibited a well-defined preference for native freshmen over community college transfers, and for full-time rather than part-time students. These preferences limited their flexibility in accommodating the growing proportions of non-traditional students who transferred from urban community colleges.

Four-year institutions prided themselves on their "sink or swim" environments intended to produce self-directed and

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, The University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

independent learners. The effect of this environment was to intensify the "culture shock" experienced by many minority students who for the first time found themselves in predominantly white institutions without the support systems they had experienced in previous schooling.

Four-year college and universities routinely accepted or even encouraged early transfer from community colleges by minority students not qualified for admission as graduating high school seniors. Waiving admission standards to achieve enrollment or affirmative action goals without the commitment to provide necessary support services contributed to high attrition rates for minority transfers.

The universities used complex procedures to determine the award of transfer credits, generally involving two separate assessments—one from the admissions office and one from the major department. Along with providing confusing information, this practice sometimes required students to unnecessarily repeat courses. There was also a tendency to award elective credit rather than credit in a major; as a result, the baccalaureate degree often required three additional years of study for those who had already completed an associate degree.

Four-year institutions tended to delegate remediation and support services to student affairs and sometimes to fragment them in ways that made it difficult for students to experience them in a coherent fashion.

Also complicating articulation were the condescending attitudes four-year college faculty and administrators showed to their two-year college counterparts. Community college professionals, in turn, resented the degree of control exercised over their transfer programs by senior institutions. When condescension and resentment were combined with the absence of regular communication—a condition observed in several cities in the study—the results were unnecessary barriers to effective transfer for urban community college students.

Strategies for Improving Articulation

The pairs of institutions participating in the Ford study were chosen because of their relatively high minority participation rates. The OERI study shifted the focus to four-year institutions that seemed to be producing the most impressive results in graduating minority students. It was not that the institutions in the Ford study lacked concern for minority student success. Many had imaginative interventions that worked. The situation they shared was a failure to define minority success as an institutional priority, along with the tendency to fragment intervention strategies where good practices were attenuated by bad. None seemed to be making a significant impact on the overall problem.

While the institutions in the OERI study are in no sense "model institutions," they employed a significant number of strategies that appear to hold promise for increasing the success of minority students in earning the baccalaureate degree.

The first set of strategies involve early intervention—correcting the problem before it shows up on your doorstep. The colleges and universities in the OERI study that have been successful in increasing the success of minority students work closely with their counterparts in local K-12 systems and community colleges. Such cooperation takes many forms, including lending staff resources to improve K-12 preparation. Beyond that, there is an urgent need to articulate academic programs between high schools and colleges, as well as between two and four-year institutions. Successful colleges and universities are working with school districts and community colleges to define the competencies that are required for high school seniors and for those who complete lower division general education requirements. Several states have mandated initiatives in this area.

Bridging strategies encompass another important category of successful practices. Colleges and universities in the study have developed a variety of programs to smooth the transition for high school seniors and community college transfers. They offer summer and orientation programs designed to develop support groups, to provide a taste of the demands that lie ahead, and to improve students' self-confidence in their ability to complete university assignments.

Faculty-to-faculty activities are among the most important articulation strategies because the results tend to persist even after special funding is withdrawn—unlike many categorically funded programs. Exchanges of curriculum committee representatives, task forces to define and recommend solutions for articulation problems, and joint curriculum development of common courses not only produce important tangible results, but also increase communication and reduce resentment between faculty members from community colleges and their university counterparts.

A fourth set of strategies includes strengthening assessment, remediation, and support services. Universities with above average records in graduating minorities anticipate preparation gaps among incoming students and act to provide necessary support. Fifth, these institutions collect and monitor information about the performance of their academic units in assisting minority students to succeed. Data are routinely gathered on retention and achievement by department, race and ethnicity, and native/transfer status, and these data are used to evaluate progress and structure or revise interventions.

Most states have adopted policies designed to remove barriers to transfer between two and four-year institutions. Coordinating and governing boards in some states have provided strong leadership to facilitate articulation and transfer. Such states contribute to the pressures on institutions to cooperate. However, barrier-free articulation depends upon good communication and effective working relationships between institutions as much as it does upon state policies—particularly as token or non-compliance with effective state policies was not uncommon. Individual articulation agreements between pairs of institutions may help to reduce barriers to transfer but are not a substitute for effective state leadership.

A final observation relates to the need to see individual practices in the context of systematic activity. In both studies, effective practices could be found. However, the environment for articulation only improves if individual strategies are mutually re-enforcing and employed as part of a consistent strategy at both state and institutional levels.

---

[1] This study was performed with a grant from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement of the U. S. Department of Education. However, the opinions expressed in this abstract do not necessarily reflect the opinions or policies of OERI or the Department of Education, and no endorsement of these opinions is intended or implied.

Richard C. Richardson, Jr., is professor of educational leadership and policy studies, Arizona State University, and associate director, National Center for Postsecondary Governance and Finance. He is co-author of Fostering Minority Access and Achievement, which contains the full report of the Ford study summarized in this abstract.

Volume 1, number 9
May 1988

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College, 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 203, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

leadership abstracts

A SEARCH FOR INSTITUTIONAL DISTINCTIVENESS

Barbara K. Townsend

Certain higher education institutions are so well known that the mention of their name immediately evokes a positive image in most people's minds. The very name of Harvard conjures up an image of ivy-covered brick buildings filled with the brightest and the best students, many of whom come from "old money" and are destined to be leaders of American society.

While Harvard has a distinctive national image, most community colleges do not. Most people outside of Illinois (and many within) have probably never heard of Elgin Community College. Like most community colleges, Elgin has high visibility within its local region and substantial visibility within its state, but it probably has only limited name recognition nationally. Yet this lack of a distinctive national image does not hamper Elgin. What is far more important to it and to community colleges generally is positive recognition within the immediate locality, and to a lesser degree, within its state.

Seeking out and maintaining this positive local and statewide recognition is a primary concern of community college leaders. They know that a positive external institutional image has important benefits, not the least of which includes attracting students, faculty and funding. These leaders devote a considerable portion of their time attempting to develop distinctive institutional images for their colleges among external constituents. Such efforts can be made more effective by a clear understanding of what constitutes institutional distinctiveness.

A Definition of Institutional Distinctiveness

A distinctive institution is one which is different or is perceived to be different from other institutions carrying out the same or similar functions. While an institution can be distinctive for negative reasons such as poor quality or service, community college leaders desiring institutional distinctiveness want their institution to be viewed as differing *positively* from similar institutions. The ideal is a community college perceived as offering something of value that other institutions in the local area or service region do not. For example, all higher education institutions offer academic programs. For a community college to be distinctive in this regard, it must offer academic programs which other educational institutions in its area or region do not, or it must offer programs which differ significantly (or are perceived to differ) in their curricular emphases, instructional methodology, time, place, or cost from similar programs offered by other institutions.

Similarly, in all educational institutions, faculty teach students. For a community college to be distinctive on this common element, it must establish a tangible or perceived difference in the quality or nature of its faculty-student interaction.

Empirical and Perceptual Distinctiveness

Institutional distinctiveness has two major dimensions: empirical and perceptual. Empirical distinctiveness exists when the elements or dimensions for which a community college claims distinctiveness have a basis in fact, that is, there is tangible "proof" of their existence. A community college is empirically distinctive in its program offerings if it is the only postsecondary institution in its service area or state to offer particular programs. It has empirical distinctiveness if it is the only area institution to offer particular support services, such as Spanish-speaking academic advisors. An institution may also be perceived as distinctive even when there is little or no empirical reality to this perception. For example, many within community colleges perceive their faculty to be more caring and supportive than faculty in four-year colleges and universities. Not only are there few, if any, empirical studies which support this claim, but faculty in small, private liberal arts colleges make the same claim.

While perceptions of institutional distinctiveness may not always have a strong basis in fact, they are nonetheless important because perceptions can influence reality. If faculty and staff believe that a concern for students is valued by their college leaders and will consequently be recognized in performance evaluations, then at least some faculty and staff will increase their demonstrations of caring about student success. The institution will have become a more caring institution in reality due to the perception that it is so.

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, The University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

Perceptions of Internal and External Constituents

In their search for institutional distinctiveness, community college leaders need to determine not only which of their programs and other elements are empirically distinctive, but also which elements and dimensions are perceived as being distinctive by important constituencies. While the usual approach to examining institution image is to determine the perceptions of a college held by external constituents, such as local citizens and leaders of business and industry, it is equally important to determine the perceptions of internal constituents, including trustees, administrators, staff, faculty, and students. The responses of internal constituents will yield a picture of the institution as it is perceived by those who have firsthand knowledge of it. While some of these perceptions may surprise, and perhaps dismay, college leaders who may hold a different vision of the institution, it is important to understand how those within an institution perceive it. These perceptions then need to be checked against the perceptions of external constituents.

Those who are outside an institution may perceive elements as distinctive that those who are within may take for granted because they are too close to them. As well, those outside an institution may not value to the same degree an element or facet that those within do. Nonetheless, the goal of a search for institutional distinctiveness is to align the external and internal views of the institution's positive elements as closely as possible.

Determination of external perceptions also reinforces the importance of the local community to the development of institutional distinctiveness for individual community colleges. College leaders who desire to achieve institutional distinctiveness must take into account the characteristics of their local community and assess the potential it provides for developing a distinctive institution. In some instances, the restrictions caused by the geographic and socioeconomic setting in which an institution is situated may not allow for much distinctiveness in its programmatic offerings. However, institutional distinctiveness might be achieved by differing qualitatively on important dimensions of the educational process.

Strategies for Achieving Distinctiveness

Achieving institutional distinctiveness is not a magical exercise involving blue smoke and mirrors. Rather, it is the result of a carefully orchestrated and persistent effort spearheaded by the chief executive officer.

The first decision to be made is the structure and organization of the search for a distinctive institutional image. The use of consultants, college committees, or task forces with representatives of diverse institutional constituents offers different advantages and problems. By whatever means, the first step of the search is to determine the college's *empirically* distinct features by conducting a thorough inventory of college programs and services and comparing them to those offered by other institutions in the service area. The next step is to interview the college's internal constituents to ascertain what they *perceive* to be distinctive about their college. After assessing the accuracy of these perceptions, the dominant ones should then be selected for use in a survey of external constituents.

Finally, community members should be surveyed about their perceptions of the college. Survey results will show how closely external and internal constituents jibe in their perceptions of the college's distinctive aspects, as well as inform college leaders about the level of awareness and interest important external constituents have for the college's empirically distinctive programs. The data provided by such a search will inform subsequent institutional strategies for achieving distinctiveness and for moving the institution toward the ideal where both internal and external constituents concur on its distinctive elements and the value they place on them.

Results of a Search for Distinctiveness

The decision to search for institutional distinctiveness involves the risk of learning that little, if anything, is empirically distinctive about a particular institution, or that both internal and external constituents' perceptions are inconsistent with the institutional vision held by its leaders. The decision opens up new possibilities for a community college. As its leaders decide to establish or build upon perceived and empirically distinctive elements, they can develop an institution whose image is a matter of personal and professional pride for all its members. Institutional leaders can also develop an institution worthy of the positive public image so vital to institutional survival.

Barbara K. Townsend is assistant professor of higher education at Loyola University of Chicago. She is editor of a forthcoming sourcebook on institutional distinctiveness that elaborates on the ideas presented in this abstract; it will be published in 1989 by Jossey-Bass as part of its series, New Directions for Community Colleges.

Volume 1, number 10
May 1988

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College, 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 203, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

leadership abstracts

AN OVERARCHING PURPOSE FOR INSTITUTIONAL GOVERNANCE

Thomas W. Fryer, Jr.

Institutional governance is often narrowly conceived as comprising merely the channels through which authority is transmitted to control and direct an organization and the people in it. The principal question asked in this formulation is "Who's in charge here?" This approach almost always tends to confuse governance with accountability, and while these are related matters, they are, in fact, quite different.

The who's in charge, factory model of governance constitutes the conceptual basis for much of the current public policy debate concerning governance of community colleges and other institutions of higher education. It assumes that organizations function hierarchically, with boards and managers at the top controlling and directing the work of the people below. Everything that happens "down the line" in the organization's structure, according to this theory, results from and is tightly linked to the downward flow of policies and directives. To be sure, there is a major hierarchical aspect to the work of all organizations, and properly so. But, there are inherent limitations in this view of the way organizations operate.

Effective Governance for Community Colleges

Governance is more usefully thought of as those mechanisms and processes for decision making and communication that enable an institution to achieve its mission most effectively. Governance is not an end; it is a means. This notion introduces the critically important idea that the missions of at least some institutions—prominently including community colleges—can most usefully be accomplished through governance processes that involve more than structures and processes for control and direction.

Control structures have as their aim achieving compliance from organizational participants. But today there are promising innovations in management theory and practice in the larger world of work. These changes depart from practices that emphasize compliance, and move toward those that attempt to elicit commitment from workers.

Community colleges are most effective in achieving their highly complex missions when administrators, faculty, support staff and trustees all exhibit characteristics that, taken together, can reasonably be described as constituting high levels of commitment to institutional ends. As a result, community colleges cannot, over long periods of time, succeed in their complex, comprehensive missions of serving a rapidly changing society if their governance processes rely predominantly on techniques to achieve compliance on the part of organizational participants.

Compliance Versus Commitment

The reader should make no mistake, however: compliance and accountability in the fundamentals of organizational functioning are necessary and appropriate. Both the people and the government they establish are entitled to safeguards and proper accounting for the resources and the trust vouchsafed to institutions.

However, beyond reasonable levels of control necessary to achieve basic organizational accountability, the attempt to control people and organizations through detailed orders, laws, and regulations is actually destructive of its own ends. When otherwise conscientious people feel themselves abused by intrusive, prescriptive rules, they carefully prepare the elaborate reports such controls always require so as to give rule-makers the illusion of compliance. Meantime, they conduct business as usual except that in the process they have grown a great deal more cynical, evasive, and distrustful. And their investment of the energy required for deeper levels of commitment is diminished.

Attempting to employ compliance techniques to achieve the higher order functions of the community college missions is particularly counterproductive. Initiative, entrepreneurship, risk taking, creativity, the investment of extra effort—these are activities that grow out of commitment to the enterprise, not compliance with its mandates.

There are no known cases in which boards, legislatures, or managerial officeholders have been successful

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, The University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

in compelling faculty members as they shower in the morning to try to think of more effective techniques for presenting a particularly challenging unit of subject matter to an enormously heterogeneous class; or of calling students at home in the evening to see why they missed class; or of pondering how to help a student in difficulty while driving to work in the morning.

Neither are the detailed directives of boards, legislature, and authority figures effective in compelling administrators to make life more complicated for themselves, for example, by proposing a new program to meet a community need, then absorbing the punishment necessary to guide the proposal through the gauntlet of naysayers and the labyrinth of approvals necessary for implementation. Neither are directives from above useful in motivating a person in a position of responsibility to take that most risky and difficult step of all: disciplining or dismissing an employee who cannot, or will not, perform the duties of his/her position to reasonable standards of quality.

The best teaching, and the most effective management, almost always depart from the line of least resistance—the compliance line—and the commitment this departure requires has to be freely given by organizational participants. It cannot be obtained on demand.

Ideal Governance: "For Whose Members Work Is Joy"

Creating the climate within which such commitment emerges and is sustained is a key task of institutional leadership. If such a climate is to remain viable over time, the conditions necessary for its preservation must be institutionalized in governance structures and processes. The goal of eliciting high levels of commitment from the people who perform the work of the enterprise is the animating value of a theory of ideal governance for community colleges.

People who work in an organization and receive compensation for their labor are responsible to perform the reasonable duties of their positions. This simple equation—wages in return for compliance with job requirements—is well understood and well accepted in the world of work. However, institutional governance should take as its goal the creation of organizational conditions which elicit from workers a desire to do more, not because they have to do more or are required to, but because they want to by their own free choice.

Just as workers are responsible to perform the basic requirements of their jobs, employers are responsible to provide certain basics for the workforce: fair and reasonable compensation, fair and reasonable treatment by superiors, a physically safe workplace, and so forth.

But an ideal governance system goes a major step further. It holds that employers have a responsibility to the human beings in their employ to attempt to make work meaningful for them in a rich and positive sense. It argues that insofar as possible employers should attempt to help workers make lives while they make a living. Thus the sense of commitment to institutional purpose that the organization seeks to evoke from the worker is reciprocated by a comparable sense of organizational commitment to the worker. Underlying this commitment, of course, is a profound respect for and a deep sense of the intrinsic value of every person who is a stakeholder in the organization.

Admittedly this is highly idealistic. The ideal, however, constitutes an overarching goal, something unattainable perhaps, but worth striving for, a guide to practice and behavior—a "superordinate" goal. In the case of the Foothill-De Anza Community College District, this is a stated goal of its chief executive officer: "to help create in Foothill-De Anza two fully functioning community colleges—as teaching, learning, and service communities—for whose members work is joy."

Personal Responsibility in the Exercise of Authority

Persons in positions of organizational authority hold in trust special responsibility. By virtue of this trust, they are appropriately held to higher standards of professional conduct in the use of their power than those who hold no such authority. Further, the exercise of authority in organizations, which includes the interpersonal behavior of authority figures, is one of the most important factors in creating organizational climate.

To be sure, this is not an often articulated view of governance. But amidst the complicated multiple realities of life in organizations, the interpersonal conduct of persons who exercise power at all levels in the organizations becomes inextricably linked both to the perception and the operation of institutional governance. This means that more than anyone else, people in positions of power, including chief executive officers and governing board members, have most to do with what the environment is like.

Thomas W. Fryer, Jr. is chancellor of the Foothill-De Anza Community College District. Further elaboration of the ideals expressed in this abstract is contained in a forthcoming book, Innovation in the Community College, to be published by Macmillan in 1989.

Volume 1, number 11
June 1988

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College, 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 203, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

leadership abstracts

BUILDING COMMUNITIES: A VISION FOR A NEW CENTURY

A Report of the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges

[Editor's note: The AACJC Board of Directors appointed a commission in 1986 to look at the future of community, technical, and junior colleges. The commission, under the leadership of Honorary Chair Senator Nancy L. Kassebaum and Chair Ernest L. Boyer, released its first report at the AACJC Convention in April 1988. The following is a summary of the principal recommendations of the commission.]

Student and Faculty Recommendations

1. Community colleges should vigorously reaffirm equality of opportunity as an essential goal.
2. Community colleges should develop aggressive outreach plans for disadvantaged students, including early identification programs for junior high school students, and displaced workers, single parents, and veterans of military service.
3. Every college should develop a comprehensive first-year retention program for all full-time, part-time, and evening students, including orientation, advising, an "early warning" system, career counseling, and mentoring arrangements.
4. Community colleges should develop programs to bring together older and younger students and those from different ethnic and racial backgrounds to enrich learning.
5. Every college should commit itself to the recruitment, retention, and professional development of a top quality faculty.
6. Community colleges should increase the percentage of faculty members who are black, Hispanic, and Asian. Efforts should be made to identify and recruit future teachers from among minority students in high schools and colleges, and to provide financial assistance to those planning to teach in community colleges.
7. Every community college should establish a faculty renewal program in consultation with the faculty supported by at least two percent of the instructional budget.
8. An innovative teachers' fund should be developed to provide small grants to faculty members to improve teaching.
9. Every community college should have policies and programs for the selection, orientation, evaluation, and renewal of part-time faculty. However, the use of part-time faculty should be limited to assure that the majority of credits awarded by a college are earned in classes taught by full-time faculty.

Curriculum Recommendations

10. The reading, writing, and computational ability of all first-time community college students should be carefully assessed when they enroll. Students not well-prepared for college-level study should be placed in appropriate developmental courses.
11. All community college students should become proficient in the written and oral use of English. They should complete a collegiate English course emphasizing writing and restricted to no more than 25 students with writing labs providing individual tutoring. Good oral and written communications should be taught in every class.
12. Adult literacy programs should be provided as part of the public service mandate of the community college and defined by statute at the state level.
13. All associate degree students should complete a core curriculum that provides a historical perspective, an understanding of our social institutions, knowledge of science and technology, an appreciation of the visual and performing arts, and an international perspective that includes non-Western culture. The core should be integrated into technical and career programs and be made available to students enrolled in non-degree or part-time programs.
14. Schools and community colleges should join in 2+2 or 2+1 arrangements in which technical studies programs begun in high school are completed in a community college.
15. Experimental "inverted degree" models in which two-year specialized programs offered in a community college be followed by general education sequence offered by a four-year institution should be available in every state.
16. The Associate of Applied Science must provide communication, computational, and problem-solving competencies, as well as technical education skills.
17. Community colleges must develop up-to-date programs that integrate the core curriculum and technical education.
18. Every community college should work with local and regional employers to develop a program of recurrent education to keep the work force up-to-date and well-educated.
19. All community college students should be introduced to the vision of lifelong learning.
20. Adult and continuing education programs should provide enrichment for citizens throughout their lives. These programs should draw upon the intellectual and cultural resources of the college; reflect both community needs and the educational traditions of the institution; and be coordinated with schools, churches, and other groups to avoid unnecessary duplication. Adult education should emphasize civic literacy for adults by focusing on government, public policy, and contemporary issues.

Instructional Recommendations

21. Good teaching must be assured as the hallmark of the community college movement, with students encouraged to be active, cooperative learners through the teaching process.
22. Class size in core curriculum and developmental courses

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, The University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

should be restricted. All members of the faculty in the core academic program should continually strengthen the literacy skills of their students.
23. Distinguished teaching chairs or other appropriate recognitions should be established at every college.
24. Community colleges should define the role of the faculty member as classroom researcher—focusing evaluation on instruction and making a clear connection between what the teacher teaches and how students learn.
25. Every college should develop a campus-wide plan for the use of technology in which educational and administrative applications are integrated, including incentive programs for faculty to adapt educational technology to classroom needs.
26. Technology should be used to continue to extend the campus, for example, by providing instruction to the workplace and to schools.
27. New uses of technology should be explored to create a national community of educators, transcending regionalism on consequential issues.

Campus Community Recommendations

28. Community colleges should be committed to the building of community beyond the classroom by strengthening the traditions of the colleges as a community of learning.
29. Colleges should make a full range of support services available to all students, including on weekends and evenings.
30. Counselors should work in close collaboration with faculty, and non-faculty personnel should also be involved in the building of community on campus.
31. Community colleges have a special obligation to break down separation based on age, race, or ethnic background.
32. Each community college should coordinate its international activities and use foreign students as campus resources for enriching knowledge and perspective of other countries.
33. Community colleges should encourage the development of service programs and relate these to classroom learning.

Community Partnership Recommendations

34. Every community should organize a school/college consortium to provide continuity in general and technical curricula; to provide teacher/faculty development; to identify at-risk youth beginning in junior high school; to provide enrichment programs to assist these students to complete high school; and to report on the academic performance of their students.
35. The transfer function of the community college should be strengthened to assist more students earn the baccalaureate degree. A special commitment should be made to increase the transfer rates among black and Hispanic students.
36. Coherent transfer arrangements must be insured in every state, including the coordination of academic calendars and common course numbering in general education sequences.
37. Community colleges must serve as a major resource in promoting economic development in their states or regions.
38. Regional clearinghouses should be established to keep track of emerging workforce needs in areas served by community colleges.
39. Partnerships that meet the training and retraining needs of employers, as well as exchanges that provide continuing education opportunities for faculty, should be increased.
40. Alliances with employers should be carefully integrated into existing community college programs and interests.

Leadership Recommendations

41. Strong presidential leadership is required to build community. Community college presidents should not only be effective administrators, but they must also be able to inspire and convey values and vision.
42. Community colleges should make special efforts to recruit leaders who are women or members of minority groups.
43. The president should be the foremost advocate for teaching and learning at the college.
44. Community college governance should be strengthened; its fundamental purpose should be to renew the community as a whole through a wide range of decision-making processes.
45. Faculty leaders should participate actively in governance, and substantive leadership development experiences should be made available for faculty and administrators.
46. The role of community college trustees should be strengthened. Trustees should select an effective leader, define institutional goals, and monitor their achievement. Professional development for trustees should be expanded.
47. The role of the board of trustees and that of internal governance functions should not be confused. Faculty, staff, and student representatives should not be appointed or elected to boards as voting members.
48. Public financing of community colleges should be strengthened. State funding formulas should fully acknowledge the nature of services provided to part-time students and the level of support required to serve underprepared students.
49. Corporations, private foundations, and philanthropies shouldbe urged to remove policies that restrict or prohibit giving to community colleges.
50. Business and industry should be encouraged to help underwrite start-up costs of technical programs in emerging and fast-changing technologies.

Assessment Recommendations

51. Classroom evaluation should be the central assessment activity of the community college.
52. Every community college should develop a campus-wide assessment of institutional effectiveness. Faculty and administrators should define in explicit terms the educational outcomes to which an institution aspires for its students.
53. College-wide assessment processes should be designed to measure the extent to which desired outcomes are achieved in students' literacy skills, general education, and area of specialization, including periodic interviews or surveys of current students, graduates, and employers of graduates.

The entire text of the report, Building Communities: A Vision for a New Century, can be ordered by calling 1-800-336-4776 (in Virginia 703-823-6966) or by writing AACJC, Publications Department, 80 South Early Street, Alexandria, VA 22304. Cost: $15.00.

Volume 1, number 12
July 1988

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College, 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 203, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

leadership abstracts

THE RESEARCH FUNCTION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES

George R. Boggs

In the major public and private universities in this country, pure and applied research are recognized, along with teaching, as primary missions. Many of these institutions are ranked among the very best in the world for the creation of new knowledge and for solving some of our most pressing human problems. Community colleges, on the other hand, are not often thought of as research institutions. Their mission is to provide quality teaching and an environment conducive to learning not only to a large percentage of the nation's freshmen and sophomore students but also to students who are increasingly diverse in terms of incoming abilities, ethnic background, socioeconomic status, age, and educational objective. Teaching loads are generally higher in community colleges, and rewards for research activity are not typically built into evaluation and promotion systems for faculty or staff. Yet community colleges cannot afford to ignore the role that research can play in improving and defending college programs and services. The research function of community colleges is different, but no less important, than in the other segments of higher education.

The Leader As Researcher

Community college presidents do not often think of themselves as researchers. The label does not seem to fit the position of someone whose job is to inspire and lead. In many ways, however, effective presidents can be among the most knowledgeable researchers on their campuses. They must be in touch with the realities of their campuses. They inspire others to be researchers. They expect their administrators to be able to perform and recognize quality research and evaluation and then to use findings to improve the quality of college programs and services.

Institutional Research. The institutional research function has gained increased emphasis, in large part due to a political environment in which external constituents increasingly question whether educational institutions, including community colleges, are delivering on their promises. Too often, community colleges suffer because state, national, or even local policymakers make intuitive judgments about college programs and students. Their conclusions are frequently incorrect but convenient for a particular philosophy or preconceived notion. Their actions are usually unsupported by any real evaluation data. However, colleges have not, in the past, been able to provide much data to show that their programs and services were efficient and effective. A growing number of individual colleges and research-based consortia are beginning to meet this need.

Program Evaluation. One of the most basic and important types of institutional research for a community college to do is program evaluation. In its most basic form, an evaluation is a study, based upon objectives of the activity or program to be assessed, that provides useful information about the degree to which those objectives have been met. Program evaluation is simply a matter of asking useful questions, gathering data to answer those questions, and then making valid conclusions based upon the data. The current emphasis on documenting student outcomes is, in fact, a call to conduct more and better program evaluation. The findings of an evaluation can be used to make either formative or summative decisions about the program or activity.

Environmental Scanning. Institutional research provides critical insight for planning, and the techniques of environmental scanning are the most useful tools to use. More than any other segment of higher education, community colleges must examine their communities. Present and projected profiles of the community and its needs are important information for a college to make decisions about the types of programs and services which will be needed and those which will not. Comparisons of enrolled students and the community at large can be used to assess whether the college is meeting the needs of all of its potential students. Internally, the college can ask whether students of different age, gender, ethnicity, or socioeconomic status are meeting their stated educational goals. Discrepancies between community educational needs and college services or between student goals and student outcomes deserve the serious attention of college leaders. The most astute leaders scan the external and internal environments of their colleges to take advantage of opportunities for

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, The University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

improvement and growth.

External Research. College leaders can also learn from research done outside of their institutions. University-based educational research is one very important source of information. The research performed at the nation's community college leadership programs or at the National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning (NCRIPTAL) can be valuable in placing local college problems in the context of more general educational concerns. Research findings are reported in community college journals, and specific reports can be found by review of a computerized educational research database such as the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges. Studies conducted by regional accrediting agencies, state commissions, college consortia, or other community colleges can be helpful. Some statewide and national research organizations are working to disseminate applicable research reports to local colleges.

Over time, the decisions made by local governing boards and college administrators have dramatic effects on their colleges and the kinds and quality of programs and services provided to students. Research can provide the answers so that more informed decisions can be made. Community colleges have organized effective research functions in various ways. Many colleges have established and staffed offices of institutional research. Others involve committees or assign individuals who are interested in a particular teaching approach or program to study it. Whatever the model used, it is important to recognize that quality institutional research requires adequate time, personnel, and resources.

The Teacher As Researcher

To argue that there is no room for research in colleges devoted almost exclusively to teaching and learning would be an attempt to build a case against any relationship between teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and research. Community college faculty, like their counterparts in the university systems, must remain current in their disciplines and must have opportunities for intellectual growth. Despite their heavy teaching loads, community college faculty author textbooks and scholarly articles, present at conferences, and are engaged in their disciplines through performances or the production of creative work. Faculty in vocational disciplines are as active professionally as are their academic colleagues.

While opportunities and resources are limited for community college faculty to participate in academic research, the very nature of the mission and the diversity of the students provide limitless opportunities for practical research on teaching effectiveness. Classroom research as advocated by K. Patricia Cross, now Professor of Higher Education at the University of California , Berkeley, holds great potential for improving the quality of teaching in community colleges. Faculty members are encouraged to try new methods of teaching and to test their comparative effectiveness. Teaching and learning become the subjects for research, and the result should be continued improvement.

The Student as Researcher

It is encouraging to see a growing concern on the part of educators to require writing and critical thinking across the curriculum. Recent research reports have confirmed the belief that students persist and succeed at a greater rate if they are truly involved in their subjects. Moreover, courses of study which do not engage higher level cognitive and affective skills do not have lasting impact. Discipline-related research projects can be designed for lower division students by teachers who see it as a way to involve students in their learning and to convey the excitement of their subjects. Field, laboratory, or library research projects can be developed for every discipline.

Community colleges can and do produce quality research. Academic research, as it is performed in leading research universities, is constrained by high teaching loads and financial limitations. However, it is important if faculty are to remain enthusiastic and current in their disciplines. Faculty members who find ways to involve students in discipline-related research provide increased opportunities for learning and persistence. Classroom research is important if educators are to uncover which teaching methods work best with which kinds of students, in which subjects, and in which environments. With the diversity of students in the community colleges, there is no better laboratory.

Institutional research is essential to support planning and to improve the quality of decision-making. Effective college leaders make use of research conducted outside their own institutions and encourage research within their institutions at all levels. Their understanding of research and the level of support they provide for it will determine the function that research plays in assisting their colleges to be effective in performing their important missions.

George R. Boggs is Superintendent/President of the Palomar Community College District in San Marcos, California. He chairs the Commission on Research for the California Association of Community Colleges. He has been a speaker at several research-related meetings and has participated in workshops on program evaluation.

Volume 1, number 13
August 1983

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College, 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 203, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

leadership abstracts

STAFFING: A KEY LEADERSHIP TASK

Ruth G. Shaw

Virtually every leader would agree that staffing choices are among the most important decisions a leader makes. Particularly when senior staff are to be selected, the course of the college is likely to be affected. Confronted recently with replacing the Vice President for Education at Central Piedmont Community College, I spent some time considering the selection process as a leadership task. As a relatively new president engaged in a lengthy process of organizational development, I saw the selection process itself as an opportunity to reinforce key values and directions for the college, as well as to evaluate the critical competencies and characteristics desired in a new educational leader.

The process which emerged, after thoughtful revisions by caring critics, was designed to reveal as much as possible about the candidates in important areas of college concern and to model the college's developing management values and principles. Although no selection process can assure the "right choice," this approach used the process itself as a teaching tool and assured that areas of greatest importance had been considered in ways consonant with college goals and values.

The fundamental assumption underlying the selection procedures is simply that process does make a difference in results. And when results are as critical as the outcome in a vice-presidential search, it makes sense to spend time in fine-tuning a process that has the likelihood of yielding that competent, caring, communicative "super-being" that every college seeks. We sought a process that would provide optimal information on candidates' abilities and fit with the institution; that would increase the likelihood of a positive, "no surprises" selection; that would allow for mutual assessment by the candidate and the college; and that would communicate and reflect institutional values and directions regarding leadership and decision-making.

Developing the Process

Since a recent step in organizational development at CPCC had been the development of an institutional values statement, it was easy to ascertain the beliefs that the selection process should reflect. It should be an open process, with as few "secrets" as any personnel selection would allow. It should provide for participation and involvement by those interested in and affected by the decision. It should fix responsibility for the decision with the individual accountable for it. It should be a rational, informed decision based on understandable criteria. It should affirm the dignity and worth of both the candidates and college colleagues involved in the process.

Additionally, the final selection process should yield information about key abilities of the candidates that are difficult to discern through routine checks and reviews of credentials. For example, resourcefulness, analytical ability, and approach to problem-solving were important criteria at CPCC. So were communications skills and the ability to use data and technology. And the significant issues of leadership style, sense of educational priorities, and "fit" within the CPCC environment were of utmost importance.

Characteristics of the Process

The process was designed to reveal candidate strengths and weaknesses as well as to model a way of doing business at CPCC. Initial search procedures were thorough, but not unusual. National advertising, statewide notice,personal letters and phone calls to national and state leaders to enlist their aid in the search, assertive recruitment of minority applicants, and "scouting" for strong potential applicants at national conferences were standard devices used.

The review and selection process, however, had more distinctive traits. Use of committees in community college apppointments is not unusual nationally; however, it is a relatively recent phenomenon at CPCC. The decision to use a committee to aid in screening and checking references, in interviewing, and in assessing strengths and weaknesses of the candidates clearly communicated the value of participation in important decision-making at the college. The explicit understanding that the final choice rested solely with the president communicated the principle that authority for decision-making follows accountability. The president, who must be accountable for the decision, would make the decision—but not without the wise counsel of informed advisors. As Paul Ward noted in "Leadership Takes Counsel: A Historical Inquiry" (distributed by Hartwick Humanities in Management Institute), such counsel-taking keeps authority "absolute but not arbitrary."

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, The University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

Since the role of the committee was to inform the president's decision, rather than to make (or even recommend) the decision itself, it was important that the president be deeply involved in selecting the finalists to be interviewed. Many a committee process has run amok when unacceptable alternatives were presented to a president who had delegated more authority than was appropriate to a committee that did not know what to do with it. While the procedure used at CPCC was unquestionably controlled by the president, it helped assure that the committee's role was to advise on the best "fit" among candidates who were qualified and acceptable to the president. It did not create the potential for a rift between president and committee, because it did not invite inappropriate committee involvement.

Implementing the Process

Initial screening and interviews were conducted by the president, using selection criteria developed with assistance from the selection advisory committee, from instructional administrators, and from other staff. Once the finalists were selected, the exciting challenge of choosing among well-qualified candidates began.

All finalists received a notebook of vital information about CPCC, and all had the opportunity to request additional information. The selection advisory committee, including twelve people from various positions in the education area and a student representative, met six times before any candidates arrived on campus. They reviewed materials and assured their understanding of the position. They developed a case study for the candidates' analysis. They developed interview questions addressing the critieria. The role of the committee was to interview each finalist and advise the president on the strengths and weaknesses of each according to the selection criteria. No recommendation or ranking was requested. The assistant to the president provided staff support to the committee. The opportunity for this group to work together in advance and to develop a common sense of purpose was key to the process.

The selection process began before the candidate's arrival on campus for a two-day visit. Candidates received the case study developed by the committee and were asked to identify information resources they would require, people with whom they would consult, and criteria they would consider in resolving the problem. These written statements provided insights into writing abilities, analytical skills, and managment styles.

The campus process began with an interview with the president, followed by a morning in which the candidates could develop their own agendas. This "open time" helped put candidates at ease by giving them control of the agenda, and it provided some indication of priorities, interests, and styles. It was revealing to see which candidates met with students and which with secretaries, and to discuss the reasons for the choices.

Lunch with the education deans and key faculty leaders provided the candidates with an informal "getting to know you" session—and gave further indication of "fit" with the institution. Meetings with the two other college vice presidents then preceded the two-hour committee interview. The interview setting was relaxed and informal, but the questions had been constructed to reveal information most essential in the selection. Candidates also had an opportunity to question the committee, and the committee remained for a short "debriefing" after each interview.

The second day began with meetings with each instructional administrator who would report to the vice-president. The agenda for these half-hour sessions was again left to the candidates, and the variance revealed priorities, interests, style, and experience. Lunch with the president and vice presidents offered some sense of potential team functioning.

A one-hour open forum, to which all employees and students were invited, was a key component of the process. Candidates were free to conduct the forum in their own styles. Some began with prepared remarks; some relied completely on a question and answer format. Selection advisory committee members and the president were on hand to hear the answers, observe, and evaluate substance and style.

Following the forum, candidates were given one hour to prepare written statements of their impressions and observations of the college and the interview process. Some used the microcomputers available to them; some submitted longhand drafts. All revealed their writing skills, their analytical abilities, their sense of education priorities, and their assessment of their fit with CPCC. A final interview with the president concluded the process.

By the conclusion of the process, each candidate had spent approximately eight hours with the president in a variety of settings. A minimum of two days had been spent on campus. Dozens of staff and students had been met. Each candidate's brief resume had been published for the college staff. The college community felt a deep sense of interest and ownership in the outcome—and had confidence in a process that modeled the values and management approaches espoused by college leaders.

The selection itself was no easier because of the process used, and the results must be measured over time. But certainly the process achieved the criteria set forth for it. It furthered the development of the organization, contributed to its climate, and enhanced a sense of common purpose.

Ruth G. Shaw has been president of Central Piedmont Community College, Charlotte, North Carolina, since 1986. James G. Wingate was selected Vice President for Education as a result of the process described.

Volume 1, number 14
August 1988

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College, 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 203, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

leadership abstracts

AN ECLECTIC APPROACH TO SERVING THE NEW MAJORITY

Robert D. Jensen

By the year 2000, California's inhabitants will number more than 30 million, securing its hold as the most populous state in the nation. California is also about to become the first "minority majority" state, in which the combined Hispanic, black, and Asian minorities become a majority of the population. These demographics present a challenge to the state's community college system to adapt to meet more effectively the needs of increasingly diverse students from varying backgrounds—many of whom lack the basic skills necessary to succeed in college-level coursework.

Adding to these pressures is an overwhelming high school dropout rate. One fourth of California's ninth graders do not graduate with their class, and the rates for blacks and Hispanics range up to 50 percent higher than those for whites and Asians. Furthermore, there has been a rapid decline over the past few years in the percentage of black and Hispanic high school graduates who enter college. As this condition worsens, community colleges will bear the major responsibility for reversing the trends, for they have become the primary mechanism for minority student access to higher education.

While California will remain in the forefront of this growing demographic trend, much of the rest of the nation will be similarly affected. These demographic trends are not simply predictions; California's future college students are currently enrolled in the state's elementary schools, where a minority majority already exists in the first three grades. Out of necessity, California community colleges have developed innovative programs and services that demonstrate success in serving the "new majority," which might serve as models to other states as they too confront similar challenges.

Searching for Models

Community colleges across the country are scrambling to find programs that address the needs of the new majority. No one appears yet to have discovered the ideal prototype. The Rancho Santiago Community College District has taken an eclectic approach to the challenge, implementing some original programs and adapting practices that have been successful in other colleges and contexts.

The district, encompassing the cities of Anaheim Hills, Garden Grove, Orange, and Santa Ana in Orange County, California, serves a diverse, multicultural community of nearly one-half million with its two campuses. Much of the district is comprised of a large minority community where 95 percent of the high school enrollment is Hispanic. Another part of the district is heavily Asian; still another includes a community of white, affluent families.

Two principles have guided the district in developing strategies for implementing programs to serve the new majority. First is the need to work closely with local K-12 districts to deal effectively with high dropout rates and to improve student perceptions of the benefits of higher education. The second principle is the importance of working with neighboring four-year institutions—California State University, Fullerton and the University of California, Irvine—to develop systems that ease the transfer process and increase students' chances for success in these institutions.

Dropout Prevention

A number of programs focus on reducing high dropout rates in local school districts, particularly among minorities.

Career Beginnings. Career Beginnings is one highly successful program for students from area K-12 districts. This activity, funded primarily through the Gannett Foundation, seeks to identify disadvantaged high school students and provide them with assistance necessary to graduate, enroll in college, and begin employment. High school juniors first attend the college during the summer months for orientation, enrichment, and assessment, and are provided with meaningful summer employment in the community. Guidance is provided throughout their senior years to ensure that they do indeed graduate.

A key component of the program uses volunteers from the business and professional community as personal and career mentors for 100 students during their senior years of high school. This one-to-one mentor activity gives students direct exposure to the world of work, provides them with practical role models, and helps them to develop networks for job referrals. The success rate thus far has been impressive: 90 percent have graduated from high school, and 85 percent enrolled in a college or university the following fall semester.

STAR. The Student Transition and Retention Program, supported by Job Training Partnership Act funds, is a second dropout prevention program which targets high school students 17 years of age and older who have been identified by their high schools to be at high risk. Most of these students are a year or more behind the rest of their class in completion of high school units, and many are enrolled in ESL programs. Students enrolled in the STAR Program are released by their high schools to enroll in any combination of adult high school,

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, The University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

ESL, and adult basic education classes at the community college. They participate in intensive career and personal counseling, are placed in part-time jobs in the community, are assisted with transportation, and are provided direction toward setting goals and enrolling in coursework for college credit. Motivated students can progress much faster in this program than in high school. For the initial class of 140 students, the retention rate was 90 percent at the end of the first year.

Partnerships with K-12 Districts

Adopt-A-School. One of the most high-profile programs has been the "Adopt-A-School" effort undertaken jointly with the Santa Ana Unified School District. RSCCD and Santa Ana's Wilson Elementary School pool resources to provide activities that benefit faculty and students from both institutions. The efforts have included an innovative critical thinking program taught to elementary school students by a community college philosophy professor, tours of the college campus, and participation in a number of student activities.

Articulation Councils. The district has also established articulation councils with both Santa Ana and Orange Unified School Districts. Through these councils, faculty in areas of business, counseling, music, mathematics, science, continuing education, and other disciplines meet to develop and implement systems that will assist students in the transition from secondary schools to the community college.

Early Encouragement. Through its Educational Opportunity Programs and Services office, the district sponsors a two-day "camp" for 5th and 6th grade students to encourage their parents to become more familiar with the college and to recognize the untapped potential in their children. Forty participants, primarily from Hispanic communities within the district, benefit from specifically tailored educational activities and presentations held at the college campus and from field trips to educational and government facilities. The camp culminates in an evening event, the "All Winners Banquet," attended by the students and their parents, and the presentation of a certificate to each student who participates.

College Readiness. Also through the EOPS office, RSCCD provides a college readiness assistance program each summer for graduating seniors with plans to enroll in college in the fall. The program includes orientation sessions, placement testing, class scheduling, field trips, guest faculty speakers, values clarification, decision making, assertiveness training, and career planning.

Awards Program. The Rancho Santiago College Foundation presents Leadership and Achievement Scholarship Awards to outstanding students from each of the 14 feeder high schools within the district. High school seniors can earn awards ranging from $200-$700 for their first year of study at the college. The foundation also works closely with the Hispanic community through local clubs and organizations to provide additional scholarships.

Continuing Education. A Title III grant funds ACCESS (Achieving College Competency through Enhanced Student Services), a program designed to assist students with limited academic backgrounds enrolled in continuing education courses to prepare for college study and to make the transition into credit programs—which historically such students have not accomplished. The ACCESS program offers students specially tailored college credit math, reading, writing, and guidance classes, plus academic and career counseling, to give them the skills and confidence necessary to succeed. The retention rate of 82 percent through the program's first year indicates early success, and the program has been renewed for a second year of funding.

Partnerships with Four-Year Institutions

Other programs have been developed to forge better linkages with the neighboring universities.

Project STEP. The Student Teacher Educational Partnership is a unique endeavor involving the K-12, community college, and university sectors to help ensure a smooth transition of students from one level of education to another. A priority activity is the early recruitment and development of future teachers of science and mathematics, particularly from minority groups.

Transfer Alliance Program. TAP formalizes academic ties between the universities and the community college in order to strengthen the transfer function. This activity focuses on a faculty-to-faculty link to strengthen the continuity of curricula among institutions. Articulation programs, similar to those described earlier, as well as numerous other activities, have cemented relationships between community college and university faculty, staff, and administration.

While it is too early to assess long-range effects, some immediate results are apparent. District enrollment shows an increase in the number of minority students. Retention in college programs has improved for these students, and significantly higher percentages of high school students participating in the special mentoring and STAR programs have graduated from high school. In addition, there appear to be substantial secondary benefits of these initiatives.

Understanding among all segments of education within the county of pressing demographic and educational challenges has improved. Local business and industry have become more conscious of the necessity for getting underrepresented students into the educational mainstream and are supporting programs with that objective. They have begun to realize that they have both a social and an economic self-interest to assist. Perhaps most importantly, cooperation— including the sharing of resources—among K-12 districts, community colleges, and universities to meet the needs of increasingly diverse student populations has been greatly enhanced.

The situation which exists among California's systems of education is not unique. The student demographics of colleges throughout the country argue the importance of searching out and implementing an eclectic array of programs that work.

Robert D. Jensen is Chancellor, Rancho Santiago Community College District. Henry Kertman contributed to this article. For additional information, contact Rancho Santiago College, 17th at Bristol, Santa Ana, CA, 92706; (714) 667-3000.

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College, 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 203, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

leadership abstracts

THE IMPOSSIBLE JOB OF THE COLLEGE PRESIDENT

Robert Birnbaum

Every decade, about 5,000 persons serve as college or university presidents. Over a term of office averaging less than seven years, the president is expected to serve simultaneously as the chief administrator of a large, complex bureaucracy, as the convening colleague of a professional community, as a symbolic elder in a campus culture of shared values and symbols, and often as a public official accountable to a public board and responsive to the demands of other governmental agencies. Balancing the conflicting expectations of these roles has always been difficult; changing demographic trends, fiscal constraints, and unrealistic public expectations now make it virtually impossible for presidents to provide the leadership that is expected from the position.

Factors Shaping an Impossible Job

A number of factors have contributed to make presidential leadership virtually certain to fall short of expectations for the position, including constraints on presidential discretion, unique characteristics of academic organizations, problems of assessing effectiveness, and limitations of the presidential role itself. Presidential discretion has been increasingly limited by external forces including greater federal, state and local controls; greater involvement of the courts in academic decision-making; and additional layers of governance, particularly in state systems. Presidential influence has also been severely limited by the paucity of resources available, and the short-term difficulty of reallocating those resources that do exist.

Institutions of higher education are characterized by a unique structure of dual control. Presidents are caught between the often conflicting demands of bureaucratic, administrative authority, responsive to the will of trustees, and the professional faculty who control academic decision-making. The president is imbedded in both authority systems and is subject to incompatible demands and behavioral expectations.

These difficulties are intensified by the absence in colleges and universities of accepted indicators of institutional effectiveness. Different constituents use different criteria, and achieving effectiveness in one area of the institution may inhibit or prevent it in another. Without accepted measures, it is impossible for the president or others to assess objectively institutional or presidential effectiveness.

Finally, presidents are subject both to role overload and role ambiguity as they respond to their own personal interpretations of their roles and to the legitimate demands of many groups. A college or university president is the executive, administrative, academic, and symbolic head of an organization whose performance is difficult to measure and that resists leadership. The president is challenged to solve problems that may have no solutions or that may require actions of others over which the president has little control or influence. He or she must confront constituencies whose goals may be irreconcilable. The pace, the unrelenting pressure, and the marginal membership in many conflicting groups limit the opportunities for a successful presidency.

No Dearth of Advice

External observers who criticize higher education leadership and the conduct of the presidency have offered suggestions meant to make the job more possible. Many of their approaches would presumably increase presidential authority by increasing rational management controls or reducing constraints on presidential discretion. A common proposal suggests strengthening the presidency by selecting better presidents. Such proposals notwithstanding, many factors limiting presidential effectiveness are beyond the control of academe.

There is similarly no dearth of advice for presidents. Various authorities have suggested that they can be successful by remaining distant or by being intimately involved with constituents; by emphasizing resource acquisition or by focusing on academic matters; by stressing accountability or by fostering creativity; by setting goals or by helping others set goals. The proposals are inconsistent, and their behavioral implications unclear. Nonetheless, several studies suggest presidential strategies that appear more likely to increase effectiveness and identify others that are frequently unsuccessful.

Successful Presidential Strategies

Successful presidents are likely to be realists rather than idealists. They accept a decentralized structure and conflicting authority systems as inherent organizational characteristics and try to work within these constraints. They know that essential institutional functions are likely to continue to operate, even in the absence of presidential direction, because of ongoing administrative systems and the largely autonomous activities of professional faculties. Presidents appreciate that some of their energy will be occupied with the day-to-day activities of monitoring these processess and identifying and attending to institutional weaknesses and problems.

However, they also recognize that they can have an impact on the institution if they focus on a small number of limited objectives or programs and devote extraordinary energy to them. Presidents can be effective even in areas such as curriculum if they are willing to accept the inevitable cost of other opportunities foregone. Presidents who try to do too many things, either at their own initiative or in response to perceived demands, often end up accomplishing none of them.

Effective presidents understand the culture of their institution and the symbolic aspects of their positions. They recognize that their effectiveness as leaders depends upon the willingness of highly trained professionals to be followers. Effective presidents spend a great deal of time in understanding their institutional culture. They go out of their way to walk around their campuses to see and be seen, to confer with other formal and informal campus leaders to solicit opinions and advice, to learn institutional histories, and to understand the expectations others have of presidential behavior. They also recognize that as symbolic leaders they must consistently

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, The University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

articulate the core values of the institution and relate them to all aspects of institutional life in order to sustain and reinvigorate the myths that create a common reality. Management skills may be neccessary, but usually not sufficient, for presidential success.

Understanding that centralized control cannot be achieved in most colleges and universities, effective presidents also realize that prevention of error is not possible in such complex, nonlinear, social systems. Therefore, they emphasize the design of systems to detect error and make institutional processes self-correcting. They support the regular collection, analysis, and public dissemination of data reflecting key aspects of institutional functioning, thus permitting various interest groups to monitor different aspects of the institution and serve as controls and checks on each other's activities. They support and publicly articulate the value of open communication and demonstrate a willingness to tolerate disagreement.

Effective presidents recognize that the inherent specialization and fractionation of colleges and universities must be coordinated unobtrusively in order to avoid alienation. They do this in part by establishing formal opportunities for interaction, and they emphasize forums such as senates, cabinets, retreats, and task forces that bring together persons representing different constituencies and different institutional levels. Senate presidents who sit on administrative councils; deans who attend senate meetings; and students, faculty and administrators who serve on joint committees interact in ways that make their perceptions and interests more consistent.

Presidential effectiveness is based as much upon influence as authority, and influence in an academic institution depends upon mutual and reciprocal processes of social exchange. Effective presidents influence others by allowing themselves to be influenced. This requires them to listen carefully, a behavior that is difficult for some who have come to believe that the proper role of leaders is to tell others what to do.

Unsuccessful Presidential Strategies

To some extent, the strategies of unsuccessful presidents are likely to be the reverse images of successful ones. They do not accept the institution's characteristics but consider them as indications of institutional pathology. They attempt comprehensive rather than incremental change, violate norms and procedural expectations, try to prevent error through complex management systems, control and filter communication, and emphasize one-way rather than two-way influence.

These strategies reflect simplicity and suggest that less effective presidents have simpler understandings of their institutions and their roles than do successful presidents. There is evidence that presidents become more cognitively complex as they become more experienced, either as a result of learning or because the less complex do not remain long in office. Presidents are called upon in many situations to function simultaneously in roles that may require different—and mutually inconsistent—behaviors, so that actions that are effective in one context may cause difficulty in another. Successful presidents have developed complex behavioral repertoires enabling them to balance various roles. Unsuccessful presidents tend to emphasize only one—for example, to act as a manager without sensitivity to academic values, or to stress institutional culture without attending to the interests of external constituencies.

Probably the most common problem of unsuccessful presidents is the disruption they cause by adopting management control systems. Both critics and supporters of higher education have accused colleges and universities of being poorly managed. In response, some presidents emphasize rational management systems even at the cost of institutional effectiveness. Some endorse new management techniques to improve organizational performance or to serve as symbols of their own managerial competence. Over the last several decades many processes for increasing institutional effectiveness have been touted. The consequences for each have largely been the same: initial administrative enthusiasm is followed by faculty resistance, disappointment, and ultimate failure.

Disruption can also be caused by the presidential penchant for reorganization, particularly shortly after assuming the presidency. Some presidents use structural revisions to exert an important influence over organizational communication, management, or decision systems; but some use reorganization for other purposes—as a symbol that the institution is now "under new management," as an apparent response to an insoluble problem, or for comfort by installing familiar systems used in previous experiences.

Presidents have little control over the basic processes of the academic program that is the *raison d'etre* of their institution, so it is not surprising that almost every study of the presidency suggests that they spend little time dealing with academic matters. When they do turn to academics, effective presidents identify high-leverage issues, for example, development of a core curriculum, through which success ripples across other programs. Less effective presidents become involved in specific programs which are based on personal interests rather than strategic importance, and which have little effect on institutional operations even if they are successful.

Ultimately, unsuccessful presidents may find themselves engaged in negative behavior or comparable manifestations of behavioral or organizational pathology. Inertia and busyness arise because there are so many things to which a president may attend it is easy to justify doing almost anything, and in the process end up doing nothing of any consequence. Presidents are likely to be unsuccessful when they pay too much attention either to too many things, or to too few.

Recognizing the significant limits to presidential leadership may be personally and organizationally useful. Paradoxically, many of the organizational characteristics of colleges and universities that make presidential leadership exceptionally difficult are the same ones that make these institutions exceptionally stable and adaptable. By giving precedence to professional rather than administrative authority, colleges and universities have been particularly effective in responding to increasing complexity through decentralized, flexible, and moderately interdependent structures. Management weakness may be a significant source of organizational strength.

This paper was prepared pursuant to a grant from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement/Department of Education (OERI/ED). However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the OERI/ED and no official endorsement by the OERI/ED should be inferred.

Robert Birnbaum is Associate Director, National Center for Postsecondary Governance and Finance and Professor of Higher Education, Teachers College, Columbia University. The complete paper from which this is abstracted is available from the National Center for Postsecondary Governance and Finance, 4114 CSS Building, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742 as OP 88:7. It will also be published as a chapter in the forthcoming Impossible Jobs *edited by Edwin C. Hargrove and John Glidewell.*

Volume 1, number 16
September 1988

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College, 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 203, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

leadership abstracts

COLLABORATIVE DECISION-MAKING

John S. Keyser

An ideal held for the leadership of community colleges is the institution in which all major constituents are unified in pursuit of excellence toward goals defined by a consensus-building process. For community colleges, these constituents include trustees, administrators, faculty, students, staff, and even members of the local community. Such a model challenges community college presidents to find ways to increase the stake that constituents hold in the institution, often by expanding access to important decision-making processes.

This is a common theme in the current literature on leadership, including the recent Report of the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges, *Building Communities*, which calls for "strengthening governance by relying on a wide range of decision-making processes that include collective bargaining, faculty senates, effective committee structures, or other mechanisms." However, the same report also implicitly recognizes the practical limitations of including representatives of major college constituencies on the most important decision-making body of the college, the board of trustees: "Since trustees are the ultimate authority to which the college is accountable, we recommend that faculty, staff, and student representatives not be appointed or elected to such boards as voting members."

So, there exists a tension between the democratic urge to involve broad representation in decision-making and the importance of effective leadership in responding to the numerous challenges facing community colleges. The conventional wisdom has been that presidents should seek counsel from college constituents while reserving the chief executive's right to act upon the best information available. Successful presidents have also learned the importance of influencing other constituents to hold similar values and goals—or at least, to go along with key decisions once made. However, in an environment in which democratic aspirations and expectations of participation are on the rise, it is not certain that the conventional wisdom to limit involvement in decision-making processes remains wise.

An Example of Collaborative Decision-Making

The recent experience of Clackamas Community College may provide useful insight into the tension between broad-based involvement in decision-making and the prerequisites of effective leadership and management practices.

For the past three years, Clackamas Community College has used a decision-making process which involves administrators, faculty, students, and classified staff as partners. The primary mechanism for this collaboration has been the expansion of the President's Council to include the president and his staff assistants; deans of instruction, students, and business services; and the presidents of the faculty, student, and classified associations. Both faculty and classified staff have contracts developed through traditional collective bargaining processes with statewide union representation. The President's Council meets once a week for a two-hour period to discuss all matters of college-wide importance.

Coupled with the expansion of the President's Council was the collaborative development of guidelines for decision-making at the college, which includes a brief statement of the purpose of decision-making, the values by which decision-making would be guided, and the structure for the process. The three years of experience with this model have identified both the advantages and disadvantages of collaborative decision-making.

Advantages

This decision-making model has moved the reality of day-to-day decision-making closer to the vision of a highly-democratized, shared-governance structure. Employees have a definition of how they "fit" in the scheme of decision-making. They have been given the charge to become active organizational citizens and problem-solvers.

The President's Council has become an open forum for the sharing and evaluation of information profiles on students, finance, instructional and non-instructional programs, and external demographic trends. This information-sharing has been the substance for developing stronger and more widely understood rationales for decisions and policy recommendations to the board of trustees. The mystery and capriciousness of decision-making has been minimized; and faculty, staff, and students have a stronger sense of being engaged in shaping the direction of the college.

The time commitment required for meetings with various campus constituencies has been reduced. Before the President's Council was broadened to include the leaders of the associations, it was often necessary for the deans and the president to meet separately with these leaders to inform,

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, The University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

justify, or rationalize decisions which had already been made. The open systems model has eliminated some of the behind-the-scenes lobbying and maneuvering which not only consume time, but typically can leave the perception of unfairness that goes with "back room" politics.

The collaborative model has produced better ideas, and these have been considered for implementation in a more timely manner. The process has enabled the college to discover and address several issues which may not have otherwise surfaced. For example, students brought to the table the need for more lights to increase the security of evening students. Faculty recognized the necessity for modifications in vocational programs to help compete in a more competitive marketplace. Classified staff alerted the council to the need for a better method of handling phone calls from people who wanted directions to the college. Each of these ideas led to improvements in college operations.

Finally, the broadened President's Council has provided a mechanism where the college's purpose—"creating lifetime opportunities for success through responsive education"—can be reinforced and seen in the broadest context. It has provided a setting in which all parties are encouraged to think of the "big picture" and to become advocates for the whole rather than for the interests of their constituents or for pieces of the whole.

Disadvantages

There are reasons to question whether students, faculty, and staff should be involved in executive decision-making. It can be argued that internal constituent groups have adequate opportunity for communication through traditional channels in more traditional organizational structures. While the open model offers exciting opportunities for improvement in communications among college constituents, there are certain risks and trade-offs which need to be recognized.

The broadened President's Council at Clackamas Community College has flattened organizational communication and may have, in some instances, undermined the authority of the deans and other mid-level managers. For example, the proposal to upgrade campus lighting was brought directly to the President's Council by the president of the Associated Student Government. Even though it was referred to the appropriate dean for consideration and study, the stage had been set for new lights to be purchased ahead of other predetermined priorities.

The process of involving all campus constituents in college-wide decision-making can require a great deal of patience. There is the danger of complex issues being "processed" to death, especially if the association presidents request more time to consider them. It is critical for the college leadership to keep problems moving toward resolution and not allow continued rumination over old problems to inhibit focus on pressing, strategic concerns.

Another drawback is the additional time required of key staff members. Association leaders have expressed concern about the extra time spent preparing for and attending a two-hour meeting each week. (They are also expected to attend a two-day planning retreat each summer.) Mid-level managers have complained that meetings are interfering with regular faculty and staff workloads.

There is also the risk that information which is openly shared can be misinterpreted or used for purposes other than those for which it is intended. A President's Council which includes representatives of all constituent groups may prove uncomfortable to presidents and deans who are used to a traditional structure where information is more tightly controlled, and where there is less chance that it could be used in an adversarial way.

There may also be an "encore problem." That is, what can be done if and when the initial enthusiasm for collaborative decision-making subsides? What modified structure could be put in its place? It is unlikely that reverting to the traditional format would be well-received by students, staff, and faculty accustomed to having a voice in institutional decisions. To a large degree, the success of the collaborative decision-making model depends on the style of the president. If he or she leaves, the college board may be left with a significant problem unless a president of a similar style is hired.

At the annual President's Council planning retreat, the questions were asked: "Is our decision-making process working?" and "How can we improve it?" There was strong agreement by all parties that communication was more open, that the college philosophy was more strongly shared, that the decision-making process was better understood, and that the level of cooperation was higher than it had been three years earlier. Recommendations for improvement included expanding even further the collaborative decision-making process to permit greater involvement by office and department staffs throughout the campus. The group's conclusion was that the college's experiment with collaborative decision-making has improved the climate and assisted the development of community at Clackamas Community College.

At least at Clackamas, conventional wisdom has underestimated the value of involving important college constituents in meaningful college decisions. The rather simple model used by the college may work in other contexts—or its implementation may be stymied by existing adversarial relationships, by unfavorable previous experiences with shared governance, or by prevailing practices and structures that fit particularly well the character of a given college. Nonetheless, our experiences demonstrate that collaborative decision-making is not inconsistent with effective management and can help build the sense of community and pursuit of shared goals that is envisioned for an ideal community college.

John S. Keyser has been president of Clackamas Community College in Oregon City, Oregon, since 1985. He currently serves on the Board of Directors of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College, 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 203, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

leadership abstracts

A PROPER ECOLOGY FOR BOARD-CEO RELATIONSHIPS

Raymond F. Bacchetti

In the main, relationships between boards and CEOs unfold. In a good relationship, the parties learn from and learn about each other. They get to know each other's strengths and blindspots and to appreciate that effective people are to be understood in terms of who they are becoming, as well as in terms of who they are. When boards take the responsibility for helping CEOs develop professionally, and when CEOs set goals for helping board members exercise responsibility well, the college very likely will benefit from this mutual investment in each other's success.

CEO Skills for a Proper Ecology

A critical responsibility of the leadership of a college is providing an environment in which good and talented people do their best work. Whether a good working environment exists throughout the institution is a test of a CEO's performance; creating and recreating such an environment for the CEO is a responsibility that falls to the board. A proper ecology involves the qualities and skills a CEO has or is developing and the conditions under which these skills are given opportunity to influence the course of the college.

Values and Educational Philosophy: *Animating principles that influence a CEO's working relationships with colleagues, choices of where to invest her or his energy, and when and where to take risks.*

In selecting CEOs and assessing their performance, boards need to concur on the essential values and philosophical dispositions of the college and the person. However, a board's ability to encourage and support a CEO will depend upon its comfort with the directions in which the CEO interprets policy, the rationales behind proposals, and the shape of agendas.

Leadership. *The ability to create a vision of possibilities and to cause others to seek the ends implied by that vision; the courage and skill to change; the insight into what needs changing.*

By their nature, educational institutions are unfinished. Any board or CEO who believes that its institution has arrived and that maintenance of the status quo is sufficient to warrant public support and staff loyalty courts decline in institutional intelligence, atrophy in its muscles, and corrosion in its soul. A board-developed environment for a CEO, then, needs to grow out of an understanding of the risks inherent in genuine leadership and has to provide both guidance and support for ventures that leaders undertake.

Rubber-stamping CEO proposals is insufficient support. Intellectually active collaboration is a more genuinely supportive board role. Effective CEOs are not solo acts; neither do they prosper if not challenged by hard questions and by high board expectations as a condition for support.

The CEO must focus on larger issues and be encouraged to do so. A board cannot second guess administrative judgments citing its fiduciary responsibility. While there needs to be review of certain administrative matters—such as budgets, bids, hiring decisions, and liability issues—the more important aspects of institutional character turn on matters of long range planning, the nature of the college environment, responses to issues of diversity and pluralism, key judgment calls with long-lasting effects (i.e. tenure decisions), and issues of institutional means and ends and accountability for achievement.

On these matters, a board cannot hover. A board crowds its CEO at peril of discouraging initiative and stealing satisfaction. To create and sustain an environment that invites people to give their best requires an atmosphere of open and honest two-way communication, rather than one in which each side has perched on its shoulder an imaginary devil whispering in its ear skeptical interpretations of what the other is saying.

Once a board is assured, it becomes advocate for success as well as judge. The best trustees are those who root for the college and its people rather than those who sit in judgment, like stern parent figures to be propitiated rather than enlisted. In rooting, they do not abandon their role as ultimate governors. Being in favor does not mean being impervious to evidence, testimony, and logic. The best trustees are both advocates and governors, for governors who do not advocate are too detached, and advocates who are not responsible become unreliable. Having it both ways creates the most challenging ecology for CEOs—they must earn support but, once earned, the support is worth having.

Management Skill: *The ability to design, orchestrate, and run an organization of effective people who are enabled to do their best work; the ability to manage processes that turn plans into outcomes and do so in ways that leave the organization progressively stronger in respect to its people's ability to work together.*

Educational organizations are not the easiest entities to manage. Power is diffuse. Parts are loosely coupled to each other and to central administration. Most institutions can seldom please all of their multiple constituencies at the same time.

To manage these entities with skill and grace is no mean achievement, and success requires, in addition to a record of good judgment and wisdom, a region of acceptance and forgiveness around individual decisions comparable to what individuals will provide their friends.

An effective board, at a minimum, needs to appreciate the management task—"appreciate" in the sense of comprehending in a general way the character and significance of what good management is. This needs to be sufficient to evaluate a CEO's performance as a chief administrator, but not so great as to enable the assessment of each managerial decision. The board should also acknowledge and praise skill in this domain, for without sound management, leadership is, at worst, impossible, at best, short-lived.

Conditions for a Proper Ecology

The conditions in which these qualities and skills of a CEO play themselves out determine their effectiveness. A proper ecology involves two conditions that a board should create, two the CEO should create, and one that they should take pains to sponsor jointly.

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, The University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

Board Responsibilities. The board should be clear about its expectations regarding its major process and product priorities. By minimizing ambiguity on major purposes and parameters, the board reduces the enervating effects of making staff guess what it wants and increases the energy that gets mobilized behind purposeful behavior. Also, by attending to process priorities as well as product ones, the board develops confidence in the way in which decisions are made.

The board must also provide the CEO with sufficient elbow room to work matters out according to applicable circumstances and established processes. A board should not abdicate its responsibility to stay generally informed of how things are going, but the focus should be on the quality of the process, on the general feel that applicable principles are honored—such as fairness, consultation, reason, and consistency.

CEO Responsibilities. The two conditions for which the CEO should take responsibility have to do with the nature of college processes and with keeping the board informed. CEOs need to attend to conceptual aspects of process, including the ways in which policies, mission statements, charges to committees, and goals are expressed. They must also assure the quality of the operational aspects of important processes. Selecting participants and establishing expectations with regard to roles, teamwork, timetables, performance evaluation, accountability, and acknowledgment are the stuff that produces results but also creates the culture of interdependence and collaboration upon which any complex organization depends for its strength.

The second CEO responsibility is keeping the board informed as to rationales and facts. CEOs who spend all day and every day with programs, people, relationships, acronymical entities, budgets, legislators, and other constituents need to take considerable pains to assure that their more intermittently involved board members are provided with background, explanations, and reminders for matters that come before them. A board with incomplete understanding of an issue and the inability to ask good questions is a poor resource for a CEO.

Shared Responsibilty. Boards and CEOs need to share responsibility for keeping each other out of crossfires. A mutually challenging and supporting environment cannot exist when people are ducking for cover, drawing a bead, or choosing up sides. In public meetings, the agenda should mean what it appears to mean, and the discussion should aim for consensus—not necessarily conclusions—on what the relevant facts, values, assumptions, and purposes are. Both sides have a significant stake in assuring that each is in a position to deal with items from a position of trust and understanding.

Division of Responsibility

The canonical division of responsibility reserves policy for the board and management for the CEO. This distinction is difficult to draw in practice. In the real world, the board has a role in management—but not to manage—and the CEO in policy—but not to decide it. Effective board-CEO relationships are determined in large part by their ability to divide responsibility along these lines.

Policies are those actions of the board that determine the ends that give the college its identity and that govern the ways in which it operates. It is the arena where the public interest plays a powerful role. The stimulus for creation or modification of policy can come from either the board or CEO, but the board should expect the CEO to craft the wording of a policy and examine and explain its implications. The board is not likely to be adept at building policy, but the board does not need to build what it decides to approve. In fact, in approving policy, a board should be creating an implicit partnership with the CEO regarding the effectiveness of that policy.

When it comes to management, the scene shifts from the periodic and somewhat removed setting of board meetings to the all-day-every-day arena of meetings, career problems, plans, individual differences, conflict management, team building, performance, and delivering the goods to students and the community. Boards establish or confirm the broad conditions within which management takes place, and managers operate the institutional processes to get the college's business done. While the board must be concerned with the processes and results, its best tools are intelligence more than expertise, observation more than experience, and indirect evidence rather than participation.

The board needs to focus on planning, setting expectations, and review. It needs to concern itself with priorities in program, budget, and facilities planning, as well as with capacity—what the college is able to accomplish at given levels of resources. In regard to expectations, the board needs to be clear about the working relationship it wants with the CEO and college managers: how it wants business brought to it, the degree of detail it wishes to comprehend, and what generally it is looking for.

The board's attitude with respect to review is critically important. If it is highly judgmental and harsh on failure, it will soon begin to see a lot of trivial successes and none of the bold but risky ventures that are the mark of institutions that make a difference. If in trying to be supportive, it appears to be indifferent to failures or unfulfilled expectations, it undermines the potential for learning from honest evaluations and is not performing its oversight functions well. It must, therefore, work especially hard and well to understand proposals before they become actions and to ask particularly good questions aimed at separating competence from circumstance. Only then will it know whether to join in the lament over a good try that did not work or to counsel with the CEO whose strategies or methods need improvement.

Striking a productive balance between policy and management functions while focusing on planning, setting expectations, and evaluation are the necessary conditions for an effective division of responsibility between board and CEO.

A board greatly assists a CEO by asking good questions—questions related to accountability, the character and condition of the college, strategic assessment, and vision. The CEO has a correspondingly important function to assist the board. One of the major contributions the CEO brings is his or her ability to attend to the board, to orient new members, to counsel with the board president on issues and opportunities, to structure agenda items so that the opportunity for productive discussion is enhanced, and to reinforce the board's best instincts and to ignore or try to improve its worst. The CEO can be an expert diagnostician and often physician to the board by means of feedback, advice, encouragement, and follow-through. A board would do well to value this piece of the CEO's role and to use it, realizing their common stake in each creating the strongest possible other.

Raymond F. Bacchetti is a member of the board of trustees of the Foothill-De Anza Community College District in Los Altos Hills, California. He is also Vice Provost and Director of the Office of Planning and Management at Stanford University.

Volume 1, number 18
October 1988

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College, 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 203, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

leadership abstracts

INSTITUTIONAL LEARNING AND EFFECTIVENESS

Paul E. Kreider

Community colleges have increasingly been called upon by various contituencies to demonstrate that they are effective in performing the distinct and numerous missions that they or others have set for them. Thus, the term "institutional effectiveness" has been popularized, and the term has become an umbrella encompassing a host of related concepts, including accountability, student outcomes, assessment, and various measures of organizational efficiency and vitality.

However, the inextricable connection between institutional effectiveness and institutional learning has seldom been articulated. The corporate literature has recently stressed the importance of organizational learning—that is, the ways in which organizations learn about their environments and ways to operate effectively to fulfill their purposes—particularly in the context of the massive restructuring taking place in the global economic order. In this rapidly changing environment, de Gues argues that "learning is not a luxury, it is how companies discover the future." (*Harvard Business Review*, March/April, 1988)

It has become apparent that organizations unresponsive to changes in their environments and frozen in unexamined patterns of ineffective behavior will flounder and decline. The literature chronicles the fact that not all organizations learn and adapt, at least not quickly. A full one-third of the Fortune 500 industrials listed in 1970 had vanished by 1983, and two-thirds of all struggling companies fail to recover. The same imperative applies to public community colleges, whose essential survival may be guaranteed in ways that private businesses are not, but whose vitality cannot be assured.

Dysfunctional organizations point out the vulnerability of all human systems. In contrast, the effective maintenance systems of living things that allow them to learn, and thus to adapt and survive, offer an extraordinary model for institutional effectiveness that is based upon institutional learning.

Learning to Know

In the "open system" view, an organization lives in balance with its external environment. Needed resources are taken in, transformed through the fueled energy of the system, and returned to the environment. Key to the process is the internal health, power, energy, and adaptability of all parts of the system. Closed boundaries and inflexible units, within or without, will block the transformational process, leaving the system unable to fulfill its purpose. It is a natural phenomenon that most living systems have built-in devices for knowing how to fulfill their purpose and respond accordingly.

Unfortunately, in human organizations, "learning to know" is most often accomplished through sometimes painful trial and error. This observation provides all the more reason for organizations seeking effectiveness to operate systems for self-study, problem solving, self-correction, and renewal. It is ironic that teaching and learning institutions often do not turn the art of knowing back onto their own systems, processes, and extraordinary human resources.

Theory to Practice

The challenge is to apply theoretical models to actual practice. Mt. Hood Community College has undertaken to achieve institutional effectiveness using an open systems model in which institutional learning is the fundamental process goal. The values that support its efforts and the processes implemented to learn and achieve effectiveness are ones that can be replicated in any community college committed to a similar vision.

All institutional processes have been designed to create a healthy context for functioning effectively as an open system. They have been designed to value the dignity and potential of each person in the organization; all members of the college community are invited to dream, plan, and shape the direction of the organization. All processes are designed to support open communication andthe sharing of good data and valid information. Diversity, even conflict, is fostered as a way to clarify issues and tap the best expertise available.

Several examples of these processes illustrate how a commitment to institutional learning can assist a college to achieve institutional effectiveness.

Focus on Student Success

The attempt to assure institutional learning was hastened with the establishment of a task force on student success. Fifty-four representatives from all levels of staff were charged with reviewing all institutional policies and procedures and to recommend improvements to increase the prospects for student success.

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

Numerous initiatives evolved from the work of the task force and subsequently have taken on a life of their own. These include changes in the college's student information system; new approaches to assessment and placement at entry; a guided studies program for high-risk students; a new monitoring system for the college's standards of academic progress; an early intervention program; a new focus on teaching and learning styles; and major development of institutional support systems, including research, planning, program improvement, budget development, implementation of a new teaching improvement process, small group instructional diagnosis, and a faculty and staff development series.

Assessment and Outcomes

Another major contribution to institutional learning was the college's participation in the Kellogg/NCHEMS Student Outcomes Project, the focus of which was on using outcomes information in program planning and decision-making.

The college's involvement in pioneering efforts in this major reform movement in higher education reinforced a growing sense of institutional pride and purpose. It also made clear that leadership is more concerned about timely and informed involvement in the process of discovery and decision-making than in either control or attainment of some predetermined goal.

The college proceeded on the assumption that every aspect of institutional and student life represented a valid basis for assessing outcomes and effectiveness. It reaffirmed the college's commitment to research on outcomes, including the extensive use of follow-up studies and recognition of the importance of student intentions in determining student success.

Creative Teaching and Learning Environment

At MHCC, the focus on student success has led to the improvement of teaching and learning. Progress has been made in using assessment strategies as an integral part of curriculum development. Intended outcomes are required to be specified as explicitly as possible in the design of curriculum. The course approval process, curriculum review process, program review and approval, strategic planning, and resource allocation processes were all examined and modified as necessary to support the creation of a purposeful teaching and learning environment.

The program improvement process has led to better quality teaching and learning, a focus on outcome measures for student success, and the creative assessment and review of organizational life. This process, combined with focused committee work, has strengthened the comprehensiveness of the curriculum, and the associate degree and general education requirements have been reviewed and enriched.

Staff and Institutional Renewal

There is an increasingly keen recognition at Mt. Hood Community College that the competence and resourcefulness of the staff are key to higher expectations and enthusiasm for institutional learning. As a result, there is strong support for professional development with emphasis upon improving participation, creativity, and effectiveness of all staff to support institutional renewal.

A model program for staff development and participation continues to be quality circles. Groups of employees voluntarily meet to identify, analyze, and solve work-related problems with the help of trained facilitators. Twenty-two staff members have been trained and continue upgrading as quality circle facilitators. Besides finding solutions, quality circles have also developed individual and group abilities which promote more effective communication and improved teamwork, attitudes, and skills. Participation in decision-making has improved staff morale. Staff performance has also improved, and motivation to learn and increase effectiveness is high.

Mt. Hood Community College's program for institutional effectiveness is based upon five key elements:

1. vision and mission: clearly defined and founded on student success
2. thematic leadership: creating, modeling, and persisting in visible leadership values
3. commitment to staff and organizational development: total organizational approach to teaching, learning, renewal, and vitality
4. valid information and data: open systems for research, diagnosis, feedback, assessment, and organizational knowing
5. integrated institutional systems: strategic planning; program review; budget processes; and multiple, cross-staff, *ad hoc* teams

The college pursues a vision of an organization energized with new ideas and new possibilities for future development. It seeks to create everyday a vital environment where successful teaching and learning can happen and where the emphasis is squarely upon student outcomes and success.

A recent institutional self-study and accreditation report reaffirmed that the college has a clear sense of direction, a certain reason for being, orderly processes, and sufficient flexibility to allow for redirection to achieve its fundamental goal—providing an exciting and effective teaching and learning community.

Paul E. Kreider is President, Mt. Hood Community College in Gresham, Oregon. He is currently organizing a national consortium of community colleges on institutional effectiveness and student success. For more information, contact the author: 26000 S.E. Stark St., Gresham, OR 07030; (503) 667-7211.

Volume 1, number 19
November 1988

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College: 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 203, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

leadership abstracts

A PRESIDENT IS A PRESIDENT IS A PRESIDENT

Barbara Kellerman

The literature on political leadership in Western thought from Plato to Freud has much to offer the study of leadership in higher education. Although higher education has more often drawn its models of leadership from studies of corporations and bureaucracies, insights drawn from political science into the nature and difficulty of exercising leadership in the American political culture are as pertinent to presidents of colleges and universities as to the president of the United States.

Leadership in American Political Culture

American political culture is peculiar unto itself, having been forged by its own idiosyncratic history and development. With regard to leadership, American political culture has three characteristics: 1) an antagonism toward governmental authority, 2) an ambivalence toward constituted leaders, and 3) an uncertainty about what constitutes effective and proper management in public life. DeTocqueville observed that Americans have "a weak confidence in the superior attainments of certain individuals" and are "not naturally disposed to take one of themselves for a guide."

This general antipathy to leadership grows, in part, out of the American revolutionary heritage. The founding fathers' aversion to monarchy, to the very notion of great power residing in one man, can be traced directly to their struggle with the king of Great Britain. Moreover, the revolution bred a whole way of thinking that was at its core antiauthority.

Once the revolution had been won, the ideas that had originally inspired it became entrenched. Rather than dissipating, they congealed to form a core of American values that have changed relatively little in over two hundred years. In *American Politics: The Promise of Disharmony* (1981), Samuel Huntington refers to these core values as the American Creed: liberty, equality, individualism, democracy, and the rule of law under a constitution.

Each of these values engenders opposition to power and suspicion of government. In sum, the distinctive aspect of the American Creed is its antigovernment character. These values, while shared and even revered by most Americans, combine to impose limits on power and on the institutions of government. They make leadership in America very difficult.

Additional Obstacles to Leadership

Capitalist culture in America supports the political culture. Capitalism romanticizes, encourages, and rewards the entrepreneur above all, and entrepreneurs are, by definition, energetic individualists rather than conforming organizational types. Thus, making it in America means staking your private claim. Free enterprise is the right of individuals to accrue what they can for themselves in a free-for-all of unfettered opportunity. Capitalism, in short, goes hand in glove with a socio-political system that values the rights of autonomous individuals over the good of the collective group. The heroic archetype of both is the self-interested go-getter, not the self-effacing team player.

What emerges from this convergence of America political and economic thought is a deeply rooted ideology that contributes mightily to the difficulty of exercising leadership in America. But it is not the only obstacle. Political leaders must also contend with the structure of governmental institutions, which tend to work in competition rather than in cooperation. The theory of checks and balances has been implemented in American government—with a vengeance. American institutions are designed to curtail the accumulation and exercise of power, as is demonstrated most vividly by the continuing conflict between the legislative and executive branches of the federal government.

To be sure, the president is not the only source of political leadership in America. At the federal level, there are other engines that drive the political machinery, including the bureaucracy, the congress, the courts, and the political parties. Also, recent American history attests to the critical role played by non-constituted leaders who operate without an official mandate and outside of the regular political system. One only needs to look to Martin Luther King and Betty Freidan to observe the leadership that they effectively provided to the civil rights and women's movements respectively.

The key point, however, is this: Political leadership in America is very difficult under even the best of circumstances. It is difficult because of the pervasiveness of an antiauthority ideology, and it is difficult because that ideology has generated the development of institutions and politics that foster competition over cooperation and that values checks and balances even at the price of progress.

Leading by Exerting Influence

Given the obstacles to political leadership in America, it is fair to ask how leaders ever manage to get anything at all accomplished. While a precise answer to the question depends upon the particular leader and leadership role, the commonalities faced by virtually all political leaders in America make it possible to identify skills and tactics that are effective in performing leadership tasks.

Political leaders in America, including even the president of the United States, are unlikely to be able to coerce others effectively or indefinitely. They must rely on influence. While some methods of influence may be harsher than others, there is no doubt that the coin of the realm of any political leader is influence rather than power or authority. Above all, this means that leaders in America must recognize the need for politicking—that is, engaging with others—on their own behalf. It also means that in order to get what they want, they must be

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

prepared to employ a variety of tactics designed to influence others—others who will generally consent to become followers only if it is in their own best interest. These tactics include:

Preemption of Problems. Presidents and other leaders anticipate their followers' concerns and act to preempt them or to ward them off.

Advance Notice. Presidents advise followers of what they will do to give them a chance to review intended actions and accommodate themselves to them.

Timing. Presidents time leadership initiatives to fit the mood of the moment.

Use of the Cabinet. Presidents brief cabinet members on pertinent initiatives; cabinet members are thus enlisted as foot soldiers on behalf of the presidential program.

Personal Appeals and Access. Presidents accept the personal responsibilities of picking up the phone or appealing face-to-face to followers whose support is needed.

Bargaining. Presidents trade favors to win backing for policies and programs.

Arm Twisting. If necessary, presidents apply pressure, by implicit or explicit threats, to get others to do their bidding.

Services. Presidents render a variety of services and favors to create a general climate of goodwill and win support on particular issues.

Personal Amenities. Presidents win friends and influence people by engaging in social courtesies that enhance their professional relationships.

Compromise. Presidents meet followers part way to get them to accept what would otherwise be unpalatable.

Outside Support. Presidents exert pressure on others who might influence those whom they seek to lead.

Education. Presidents become teacher-leaders who educate, excite, and mobilize would-be followers.

Impression Management. Through some combination of guile and intuition, presidents convey the impression that they in particular are suited to the presidential role.

Ingratiation. Presidents engage in behaviors deliberately designed to make them attractive or winning to other people.

Also, there are at least two personality traits that are virtual requisites to exercise political leadership in America. First, because leadership must be attempted before it can succeed, would-be leaders must be motivated to make that attempt by the need for some kind of power or achievement. Second, since successful leaders function within the world of other people, they must be relatively extroverted, socially active and facile. These characteristics and tactics are the basis for successful political leadership in the essentially hostile climate of American political and economic culture.

A President Is a President Is a President

The literature on leadership in higher education is riddled with anxiety. Important books in the field describe hard times on campus and mounting problems, including enrollment declines, disintegrating curricula, increased competition, fiscal uncertainty, and external meddling. These same works frequently propose that the answer to previously unanswerable questions and the solution to previously insoluble problems is the proverbial man on the white horse—the effective leader. The assumption is that more than any other single factor good leadership can bring an institution success.

Studies continue to conclude that the assumption is correct, that only with good leadership can colleges and universities respond effectively to the challenges facing them. Yet even as students of the crisis in higher education look to the leader as a would-be knight in shining armor, they are nevertheless aware of the constraints under which leaders must operate.

In fact, the constraints within which today's college and university presidents must operate can be said to constitute the culture of higher education. These include: more federal and state controls, more influence by faculties over academic issues and policy, more objectives to be met, greater ambiguity of goals, less consensus, more fractionalization of the campus into special interest groups, less sense of community, bureaucratization of staff, declining fiscal resources, uncertain technologies, and fewer opportunities for institutional growth and development.

Thus, three themes emerge from the literature on higher education. Theme one is that colleges and universities are in trouble. Theme two is that the single most important element in solving their problems is the effective leader. Theme three is that—theme two notwithstanding—leadership in higher education is difficult to exercise. It is at this point that the fields of political science and higher education intersect. While much has been written about the uniqueness of institutions of higher education, there exist powerful similarities between the leadership dilemmas faced by political and educational leaders.

Both the literature of higher education and political science are preoccupied with constraints on leadership. As the next president of the United States will struggle with the difficulties of exercising leadership in contemporary American culture, so too will current and future presidents of colleges and universities. Educational leaders can learn from their political counterparts and recognize the gap between the rescue missions they are generally expected to undertake and what it is they will realistically be able to accomplish.

As political leaders must politick to exert leadership, so too must college and university presidents. Rather than relying on others to simply do their bidding, educational leaders must recognize that they must influence and persuade their would-be followers. The tactics previously listed apply equally well to political and educational leaders: a president is a president is a president.

It would be a mistake not to concede, however, that despite the similarities among chief executives, there are profound and important differences as well. The president of a college or university who would forget that his or hers is an institution of higher learning, dedicated not to the pursuit of profit but of knowledge, is destined to play a pedestrian role at best. Therefore, it is incumbent on college presidents in particular to turn to the literature on leadership and politics, if only to keep in their minds' eyes Plato's notion of the philosopher-king.

This paper was prepared pursuant to a grant from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement/Department of Education. However, the opinions expressed here do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the OERI/ED, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

Barbara Kellerman is dean of Graduate Studies and Research at Fairleigh Dickinson University in Teaneck, New Jersey. She is author and editor of a number of books and articles on leadership, including Leadership: Multidisciplinary Perspectives (1984), The Political Presidency: The Practice of Leadership (1984), and Political Leadership: A Source Book (1986).

Volume 1, number 20
November 1988

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College: 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 203, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

leadership abstracts

BEWARE OF CHARISMA

Daniel J. Boorstin

The unanimous complaint about our presidential candidates is that they lack "charisma." People somehow yearn for another touch of the "Kennedy magic." They forget how short-lived it was and how much it now owes to the afterglow of martyrdom. They also forget that a historic achievement of our constitutional democracy was to free us from the bonds—and follies—of charisma. For millenniums, European peoples were victims of the divine right of kings. Even after that divinity was dissolved, charisma reappeared in the modern claims of a Duce, a Führer and a party-anointed General Secretary.

Few of the horrors of political life today cannot be traced back to the arrogance of someone who claimed or was credited with charisma. As we choose our new President, we should not forget that a special virtue of our institutions is that they do not depend on the claims of divinity. We are perhaps the first nation founded without such a claim—without a Romulus or a Virgil. Even the atheistic French Revolutionaries worshiped their Goddess of Reason, for whom they violated the altars of their churches. But our nation was based on a "decent respect to the opinions of mankind."

Charisma is "the gift of prophecy . . . which enabled its possessors to utter, with the authority of inspiration, divine strains of warning." Sociologists and anthropologists discover charisma in the claims of priests in primitive societies to powers of healing prophecy. Every religion has had its charismatics. In secular society, too, as the sociologist Max Weber observed, leaders have often claimed charisma—"a certain quality of an individual personality by virtue of which he is set apart from ordinary men and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman . . . powers or qualities." What better description of the qualities we do not want in a President?

"Representative Men" was Ralph Waldo Emerson's 1850 phrase for the great men in a democracy. Only a few years before, Thomas Carlyle, the dyspeptic enemy of democracy, had written that "hero worship"—"transcendent admiration of a great man"—was an inevitable, and even admirable, quality of mankind. Emerson, who could not share this idolatry, preferred to see greatness in the qualities of Everyman. For him, even Shakespeare's grandeur was not in his originality but in his representativeness. His Shakespeare was "conscious of no Heavenly message."

Our politics, unlike that of France, Spain and Italy, has been less a search for the political hero than for the Representative Man who possesses common virtues to an uncommon degree. However prosaic, our leader is apt to be Dale Carnegie's man who wins friends and influences people: So we might describe Washington, Jackson, Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, FDR, Truman and Eisenhower. While TV technology has given a dangerous new reach to preachers who claim charisma, it has also given us vivid closeups that nourish our skepticism of anyone's claim to speak for God. Our federal constitutional tradition has kept us free from religious warfare, political persecution and intolerance. We are apt to remain so if we continue to be suspicious of any

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, University of Texas at Austin with support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

ERIC Clearinghouse for
Junior Colleges
FEB 10 1989

who pretend to speak for God. And we would do well to stay with our traditional, if less exhilirating, quest for Representative Men.

But is there some common quality among those Representative Men who have been most successful as our leaders? I call it the need to be *authentic*—or, as our dictionaries tell us, "conforming to fact and therefore worthy of trust, reliance or belief." While the charismatic has an uncanny outside source of strength, the authentic is strong because he is what he seems to be.

In our miscellaneous America, the authentic helps us luxuriate in our variety. The qualities that may make a person authentic are as varied as the people themselves: They can be Washington's imperturbable dignity, Lincoln's homely Biblical phrases, TR's bluster, FDR's jaunty cigarette holder, Truman's crisp colloquial diction or Eisenhower's warm smile. The authentic is the man who somehow shows us that he is not trying to be something that he is not. He is credible. And he encourages us. For while we cannot and dare not all aim at charisma, we can all enjoy being ourselves, and so feel a warm affinity for the leader by sharing his virtue.

Copyright, 1988, Daniel J. Boorstin, from June 20, 1988, *U. S. News & World Report*.

Daniel J. Boorstin is contributing editor for U. S. News & World Report. He is Librarian of Congress emeritus and previously director of the National Museum of History and Technology, senior historian of the Smithsonian Institution, and Preston and Sterling Morton Distinguished Service Professor of American History, the University of Chicago. He is author of numerous books, including The Discoverers (1985); the third volume of his trilogy, The Americans: The Democratic Experience, (1973) won the Pulitzer Prize.

Volume 1, number 21
December 1988

Index of 1988 *Leadership Abstracts*

v1n1: *Revitalizing Leadership for Community Colleges*, Terry O'Banion and John Roueche
v1n2: *Making Boards Presidential Assets*, Charles J. Carlsen
v1n3: *The Discovery Stage of Presidential Succession*, Estela M. Bensimon
v1n4: *Leadership Is Not Tidy*, Dale Parnell
v1n5: *The Meaning of Good Faculty Leadership*, Anna Neumann
v1n6: *Bringing Focus to the Presidency*, George B. Vaughan
v1n7: *Individual and Group Responsibility for Leadership Development*, Jess H. Parrish
v1n8: *The 21st Century Executive*, from *U.S. News & World Report*
v1n9: *Improving Transfer for Urban Community College Students*, Richard C. Richardson, Jr.
v1n10: *A Search for Institutional Distinctiveness*, Barbara K. Townsend
v1n11: *An Overarching Purpose for Institutional Governance*, Thomas W. Fryer, Jr.
v1n12: *Building Communities: A Vision for a New Century*, A Report of the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges
v1n13: *The Research Function of Community Colleges*, George R. Boggs
v1n14: *Staffing: A Key Leadership Task*, Ruth G. Shaw
v1n15: *An Eclectic Approach to Serving the New Majority*, Robert D. Jensen
v1n16: *The Impossible Job of the College President*, Robert Birnbaum
v1n17: *Collaborative Decision-Making*, John S. Keyser
v1n18: *A Proper Ecology for Board-CEO Relationships*, Raymond F. Bacchetti
v1n19: *Institutional Learning and Effectiveness*, Paul E. Kreider
v1n20: *A President is a President is a President*, Barbara Kellerman
v1n21: *Beware of Charisma*, Daniel J. Boorstin

Don Doucette, editor

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College, 25431 Cabot Road, Suite 203, Laguna Hills, California 92653, (714) 855-0710. It is issued twice monthly and distributed to the chief executive officer of every two-year college in the United States and Canada. *Leadership Abstracts* is intended for duplication and further distribution. Copyright held by the League for Innovation in the Community College.